

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1901.

## THE PERSONAL PRONOUN IN THE POEMA DEL CID.<sup>1</sup>

The personal pronouns in Old Spanish have not been neglected by investigators in the field of Romance philology. Within the last few decades there have appeared in the columns of the *Romania*, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, *Il Propugnatore*, etc., valuable contributions treating specially of the personal pronouns or touching upon them incidentally in connection with other matter. Of articles on the *Poema del Cid* relating more or less to the subject of this paper it is only necessary to refer to those of Cornu, Baist, Restori, Nyrop, Cuervo, Gessner, in the journals above mentioned.

In the preparation of this article it has been the purpose of the author to set forth in tabulated form the personal pronouns actually occurring in the *Poema del Cid*, giving also the combinations in which they appear, and to illustrate what seem to be the chief peculiarities of their usage in the *Poema*. The statistics are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, and where the latter is the case it has been so stated.

It is needless to say that it would be exceedingly difficult to present anything original on a subject which for many years has found contributors among the foremost Romance scholars of the century. Consequently, there is little, if anything, in this article which cannot be found scattered in the large manuals of Romance philology and in the various journals

<sup>1</sup> I have consulted, in the preparation of this article, besides the general works of Diez, Meyer-Lübke, Gruber (*Grundriss*), the grammars of Knapp, Sauer, and Förster, also the following special treatises: Araujo, *Gramática del Poema del Cid*, Madrid, 1897; Kürbs, *Untersuchung der Sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten des Poema del Cid*, Frankfurt a.M., 1893; Keller, *Historische Formenlehre der Spanischen Sprache*, Murrhardt, 1894; Cornu, and Baist, various articles in *Romania*, *Zeitschrift f. Rom. Phil.*, *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil.*; Gessner, *Das spanische Personalpronomen*, *Z. f. Rom. Phil.*, xvii, 1-54; Mugica, *Supresión de la vocal enclítica de los pronombres en el Poema del Cid*, *Z. f. Rom. Phil.*, xviii, 540-545; Cuervo, *Los casos enclíticos y proclíticos del pronombre de tercera persona en castellano*, *Romania*, xxv, 95-113.

devoted to this subject. But, while this paper presents nothing new, it is original in so far that it is the subject of independent work in the first place. Most of the material has been gathered from notes taken while reading the *Poema*. The writer is personally responsible for the illustrative examples, excepting one or two taken from Gessner's article.<sup>2</sup> The text employed is that of Menéndez Pidal, (Madrid, 1898) which is the most reliable.

In the following instances I have ventured to disagree with some of my authorities. I prefer to state the details here rather than later:

*Dand nos*, line 273.

Lidforss considers the first *n* an error by the copyist: "*Dand*, que con la venia de otros criticos creo error de pluma, lo mismo que *sabent*, *rogand*, *hedand*, etc."<sup>3</sup>

Cornu assumes *dand nos* as the second stage in the transformation of *dadnos* to *dandos*, viz: *dad nos* > *dandnos* > *dandos*, the second *n* disappearing by dissimilation. He assumes a similar development for *rienda*: *retina* > *redena* > *rendna* > *rienda*, and for *candado*: *catenatus* > *cadenado* > *candnado* > *candado*.

While I do not presume to dispute an authority like Cornu, it seems, however, that this explanation, which is based only on hypothesis, is not the simplest one, at least not in the case of *dand nos*. Unless *dand* is a purely clerical error, which I am not inclined to believe, I would suggest that the copyist has written *dand*, and, not understanding the force of *n* as a part of the pronoun, has given to the latter its proper form *nos*. But nothing can be affirmed with certainty on this point since the spelling in cases of this kind is not fixed. Cf. *dandos*, 3468, *dadnos*, 2562, *mandad nolos*, 2364, etc.

*Ge-* in lines 3676, 3679, 3681.

*Ge-* is found combined with the definite article in 3676: *falsso gela guarnizon*, repeated in 3679 and 3681.

*Ge-* may be explained in these lines as the dative (*illi* > *ge* > *se*), as it is elsewhere, but a preferable interpretation seems to me to make it the reflexive, direct object of *falsso*,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Los Cantares de Myo Cid*, p. 111.

with *guarnizon* as subject of the clause. It is then assumed that the copyist has erroneously written *g* instead of *s*. Such a mistake could easily happen, the sounds of these two consonants being so much alike, as shown by the subsequent development of *ge* to *se*. Nor is it difficult to find other examples of confusion between *g* and *s* both in the *Poema* as well as in other Old Spanish texts. Cf. *eglesia*, 367, *eclegia*, 2241, *eclegia*, 2449: *gelo* for *selo* (= *sibi illud*), 768: *Sabet, el otro non gelo oso esperar*, that is, 'he dared not await it (the blow) for himself'.<sup>4</sup>

#### A. FIRST PERSON.

- SING. NOM. yo, 74; hyo, 2086.  
OBL. me, 9, 76; -m, 157, 963; m-, 3665; -n, 1277, 3391.  
PREP. a mi, 240, de mi, 205, por mi, 504, pora mi, 249, conmigo, 1045, 1258, 1606.  
PLUR. NOM. nos, 138.  
OBL. nos, 129, 667, 831.  
PREP. a nos, 1498, connusco, 388.

#### B. SECOND PERSON.

- SING. NOM. tu, 361, 3332.  
OBL. te, 335, 338; -t, 353, 3343, 3344, 3333; -d, 3322, 3365.  
PREP. a ti, 8, 362, en ti, 357, por ti, 3320, contigo, 349.  
PLUR. NOM. uos, 47, vos, 194.  
OBL. uos, 44, 73, 108; -os, 986, 1401, 2027, 3215.  
PREP. a uos, 256, de uos, 503, con uusco, 75, 231.

#### C. THIRD PERSON.

##### Masculine.

- SING. NOM. el, 67, 78; ele, 1896, 2938; elle, 1353, 1398, 2812.  
OBL. le, 64, 636, 712, 713; lo, 16, 629, 745; -l, 750, 751, 761, 1032, 1-, 62, 975; ge, (Dat.) 26, 163.  
PREP. al, 245, a el, 1362; con el, 305; del, 23, sobrel, 1053.  
PLUR. NOM. ellos, 415, 544, 2745.  
OBL. Dat. les, 36, 165; los, 154, 2403; ge-, 511, 1363.  
Acc. los, 2, 588, 720; les, 66.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Gessner, p. —; Araujo, pp. 143-4 and foot-notes.

- PREP. con ellos, 293, dellos, 111, 622, entrellos, 595.

##### Feminine.

- SING. NOM. ella, 328.  
OBL. la, 12, 179, 423, 690; -l, 38; l, 914.  
PREP. a ella, 254, con ella, 691, della, 495, en ela, 1241, sobrella, 183, 1203.  
PLUR. NOM. ellas, 1609, 2737.  
OBL. Dat. les, 1382, 2570; las, 1083.  
Acc. las, 86, 117, 255, 276.  
PREP. a ellas, 2738, antellas, 1747, con ellas, 1610, 2620, dellas, 257, por ellas, 1485.

##### Neuter.

- SING. NOM. lo, 635.  
OBL. lo, 42, 82, 636; llo, 3367.  
PREP. a lo, 157, en ello, 1941, dello, 386, por ello, 2641.

##### Reflexive Forms.

1. me, 156.
2. te, 3324; -t, 3333.
3. se, 354, 405, 436; -s, 69, 154, 200; por si, 2259; consigo, 67, ge, 3676, 3679, 3681, Acc.; 768, Dat.
4. nos, 146, 280.
5. uos, 317, 2792.
6. se, 105, 134, 381; sse, 403.

##### Remarks.

1. *-migo*, *-tigo*, *-sigo*, *nusco*, *usco* are remnants of the Latin *mecum*, *tecum*, *secum*, *nobiscum*, *vobiscum*. Their etymology having been forgotten, they were subsequently written with *con* as one word.

2. *ge*, in *gelo*, *gela*, *gelos*, *gelas*, represents an intermediate stage in the development of the Latin *illi*, *illis* to the modern *se*. *Illi*, *illis* > *lle-*, *lles-* > *ge-*, *je-*, *ges-*, *jes-*, finally *ge* for both singular and plural by assimilation of *s*; *ge* being pronounced like Ptg. *che* the transition to *se* then became easy. On *ge*, reflexive, see above.

3. Conjunctive *os* for *vos* occurs four times in the *Poema* (See paradigm above). When *os* follows the Imperative the final letter of the verb is retained, whereas in Modern Spanish this final letter is dropped. *-os* is used with the infinitive in one of the four instances referred to: *leueros*, 1401.

4. The Leonese forms *ele*, *elle*, m.s., occurs five times, *llo*, n.s., once.

5. Conjunctive *me, te, le, la, lo, se* are frequently joined to the preceding word, less often to the following, and the final vowel of the pronoun is elided: *curiam*, 3664, *metistet*, 3334, *dioſ*, 353, *noſ*, 25, *feridaſ*, 38, *metioſ*, 711, *tornos*, 49, *vedada lan* 62, *landa*, 778, *comidios*, 507. Elision does not take place, of course, if the verb ends in a consonant: *plazme*, 180.5

6. The regular form of the acc. m.s. 3. is *lo*, but *le* is used quite frequently, likewise *l-*, *-l*.

*Los* occurs as dat. m. plur. 3., instead of *les* which is the regular form, cf. ll. 154, 2403.

*Les* as acc. m. plur. is used at least twice, cf. ll. 66, 1417.

*Las* for *les* as dat. f. plur. is used at least once, cf. l. 1083.

7. Metathesis occurs when a conjunctive form is joined to the Imperative: *dandos* < *dadnos*, 3468 (Cf. also *dand nos*, 273): *dezildes* < *dezidles*, 384; *contalda* < *contadla*, 181; *daido* < *dadlo*, 823; *yndos* < *ydnos*, 833.

8. Assimilation may be observed in the following instances: *d* to *l* in *prendedlas* > *prende-las*, 2136; *r* to *l* in *acogerlo* > *acogello*, 883; *auerlas* > *auellas*, 887; *verdarlo* > *vedallo*, 2967; *s* to *l* in *mandad nos los* > *mandad nolos*, 2364; *r* to *s* in *adobarse* > *adobasse*, 1700; *m* to *n* before *s* in *sim salue* > *sin salue* 3391; before *l* in *Que me las* > *quenlas*, 1277.

9. The prepositions *a, de, entre, sobre, ante* coalesce with the pronouns which they govern: *al* < *a el*, 245; *della* < *de ella*, 495; *del* < *de el*, 23; *entrellos* < *entre ellos*, 595; *sobrella* < *sobre ella*, 1203; *antellas* < *ante ellas*, 1747.

10. The language of the *Poema* allows greater freedom in the position of the object pronoun than the Modern Spanish.

a. The pronoun often follows the verb in cases where modern usage would prefer it to precede.

*Don Rachel e Vidas a myo Çid besaron le las manos*. 159.

*El Çid a doña Ximena yua la abraçar*;

*Doña Ximena al Çid la manol va besar*. 368-369.

*A Mynaya Albarfanez mataron le el cauallo*. 744.

*Quiero uos dezir del que en buen ora nasco e çinxo espada*. 899.

5 For full statistics on the elision of the final vowel of enclitic pronouns, see Mugica, l.c.

*Quando los fallo, por cuenta fizo los nonbrar*. 1264.

*E aduxiessen le a Bauieca; poco auie quel ganara*. 1573.

*Su mugier e sus fijas subiolas al alcaçar*. 1644.

*Myo Çid al rrey Bucar cayol en alcaz*. 2408.

*Martin Antolinez e Diego Gonçalez firieron se delas lanças*. 3646.

b. When other words come between the object and predicate the pronominal object may precede or follow the verb.

*Rrachel a myo Çid la manol ba besar*. 174.

*A myo Çid, el que en buen ora nasco,*

*Dentro a Valençia lieuan le el mandado*.

1560-1.

*Aquelos atamores a uos los pondran delant e veredes quanles son*. 1666.

*Este casamiento otorgo uos le yo*. 3418.

c. Owing to the tendency of the object pronoun to follow its verb, the object of the separable tenses, the indicative future and conditional, often comes between the infinitive and the auxiliary. This occurs in the following lines of the *Poema*:

21, 76, 80, 84, 92, 117, 133, 161, 197, 198, 229, 251, 272, 280, 390, 528, 586, 667, 690, 947, 966, 987, 1035, 1046, 1250, 1259, 1423, 1438, 1447, 1487, 1523, 1641, 1668, 1688, 1690, 1768, 1808, 1820, 1908, 1945, 1946, 2045, 2330, 2366, 2410, 2411, 2545, 2546, 2563, 2564, 2568, 2575, 2627, 2663, 2733, 2992, 3030, 3141, 3168, 3223, 3359, 3411, 3450, 3451.

d. The pronoun object of an infinitive depending upon another verb is generally joined to the governing verb, which it either precedes ( $\alpha$ ) or follows ( $\beta$ ). This applies also to reflexive verbs ( $\gamma$ ). In a few instances the pronoun comes after the infinitive ( $\delta$ ).

$\alpha$ . *Tornos a sonrisar; legan le todos, la manol ban besar*. 298.

*Alos indios le dexeste prender; do dizen monte Caluarie*. 347.

*Corrio la sangre por el astil ayuso, las manos se ouo de vntar*. 354.

*Mas el castiello non lo quiero hermar*. 533.

*E fizieron dos azes de peones mezclados, quilos podrie contar?* 699.

*De todo myo rreyno los que lo quisieren far*. 891.

*Quenlas dexe sacar*. 1277.

- Virtos del Campeador a nos vienen buscar.* 1498.  
*Essora les conpieçan a dar los yfantes de Carrion.* 2735.  
 et passim.
- β. *E el a las niñas torno las acatar.* 371.  
*Saliolos rreçebir con esta su mesnada.* 487.  
*Çiento moros e çiento moras quiero las quitar.* 534.  
*Quierol enbiar en don .XXX. caualllos.* 816.  
*El cauallo corriendo, ualo abraçar sin falla.* 920.  
*Mandolos ferir myo Çid, el que en buen ora nasco.* 1004.  
*Plogo al Criador e ouieron los de arrancar.* 1721.  
 et passim.
- γ. *Mañana era e pienssan se de armar.* 1135.  
*Mager les pesa, ouieron se adar e a arancar.* 1145.  
*De pies de cauillo los ques pudieron escapar.* 1151.  
*Non osan fueras exir nin con el se aiuntar.* 1171.  
*Quando vio myo Çid las gentes iuntadas, compeços de pagar.* 1201.  
*Luego toman armas e tomanse a deportar.* 1514.  
 et passim.
- δ. The object pronoun follows the infinitive.
- a. When the governing verb is reflexive:  
*Nos detardan de adobasse essas yentes christianas.* 1700.  
*Nos fartan de catarle quantos ha en la cort.* 3495.
- b. When the governing verb is to be supplied:  
*Tanta cuerda de tienda y veriedes quebrar, Arancar se las estacas e acostar se atodas partes los tendales.* 1141-2.  
*Mando uos los cuerpos ondrada mientras servir e uestir*  
*E guarnir uos de todas armas coño uos dixieredes aqui.* 1871-2.  
*Querer uos ye ver e dar uos su amor.* 1945.  
*Veriedes quebrar tantas cuerdas e arrancar se las estacas,*  
*E acostar se los tendales, con huebras eran tantas.* 2400-1.
- c. When the infinitive precedes the governing verb:

- Enbiar uos quiero a Castiella con mandado.* 813.  
*Sobre aquesto todo, dezir uos quiero, Minaya.* 890.  
*Si me vinieredes buscar, fallar me podredes.* 1071.  
*Quando Dios prestar nos quiere, nos bien gelo gradescamos.* 1298.  
*Hyr se quiere a Valençia, a myo Çid el de Binar.* 1416.  
*Dezir uos quiero nueuas de alent partes del mar.* 1620.  
*Fasta do lo fallassemos buscar lo yremos nos.* 1951.  
*E a don Fernandode a don Mego aguardar los mando.* 2168.  
*Prinado cauurga, a rreçebir los sale.* 2886.  
*Ebayr le cuydan a myo Çid el Campeador.* 3011.  
 et passim.

d. Note also the following:

- Veriedes armar se moros, apriessa entrar en az.* 697.  
*Aqui veriedes quexar se yfantes de Carrion.* 3207.

II. The use of *tu* and *vos*.

*Tu* is used

- a. In addressing the Deity:  
*Grado ati, Señor padre, que estas en alto.* 8.  
*Tu eres rrey de los rreyes.* 361.
- b. Toward persons of inferior rank, toward relatives and intimate friends:  
*E verdad dizen en esto, tu, Muño Gustioz.* 2955.  
*Oheres, myo sobrino, tu, Felez Munoz?* 2618.
- c. Sometimes in anger as a mark of disrespect:  
*Verte as con el Çid.* 2410.  
*Tulo otorgaras a guisa de traydor.* 3350.  
*Vos* is more formal and is used toward persons to whom respect is shown:  
*Non uos osariemos abrir.* 44.  
*Uos sodes el myo diestro braço.* 753.  
 In addressing the Virgin both forms are used, cf. lines 218 and 221. Confusion between *tu* and *vos* may be noticed in *mientra que visquieredes bien se fara lo to.* 409.

NILS FLATEN.

St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.



A VOLKSLIED AS SOURCE OF TWO  
OF WILHELM MÜLLER'S SONGS.

SOME time ago (*Four. Germ. Phil.*, vol. iii, p. 39) I called attention to a stanza of Müller's *Thränen und Rosen*, which was copied from a stanza of similar appearance in the Volkslied *Abrede*, printed in J. G. Meinert's *Alle teutsche Volkslieder in der Mundart des Kuhländchens*, Wien und Hamburg, 1817, p. 227. At that time I had never seen the book in question, but since, through the generous courtesy of Prof. Julius Goebel, of Stanford University, I have come into possession of it, and find that

Meinert (p. 227.)

Ich hor dich ni verlösse,  
Dos ful mir ju ni ai,

Ock seille de Lait' ni weisse  
Vo onser Liv' on Tra'i.

(p. 228.)

Onn giest du ai de Schenke,  
Su triet ni voenne vir,  
Triet ai dan heindesten Weinkel,  
Fir g'wiess! ich zih dich avir.

Onn wenn ich dich war schwenke,  
Su siech du mich ni ô;  
Do wa'n de Lait' gedenke,  
De sayn anander grom.

Onn red' ich meit a'r anden,  
Do krenk du dich ock ni;  
Ich rede meit a'r anden,  
Ich denk' allaen ouff dich.

Onn wiest du welle haem gien,  
Su woet ock ni ouff mich:  
Gie fuett dos schmole Staigle,  
Fir g'wiess! ich kuomm' dir anôch.

And from the first four stanzas of the same song in Meinert, Müller made his nine stanzas in *Thränen und Rosen*, the first seven of which are a mere expansion of the Volkslied, the

not alone the single stanza in Meinert's collection has been used by Müller, but that the entire song of which it is part has been adopted by him, and indeed with such rare economy of material, that the first four stanzas of it have become in his *Thränen und Rosen* (Ged. v. W. M. 1868, I, p. 138) nine stanzas, while its last five stanzas have become the seven stanzas of Müller's *Abrede* (p. 81)—the poet thus retaining in one of his songs the very title of the Volkslied, that nothing might be lost. For convenience of comparison, the Volkslied is printed below on the left and Müller's songs on the right, side by side.

Müller (p. 81.)

„Die Fiedel ruft zum Tanze,  
Meine Tänz'rin sollst du sein;  
Ich kann nicht von dir lassen,  
Esfüllt mir gar nicht ein.“—

„Mein Zorn—der ist verschwunden,  
Mein Tanzkleid ist bereit;  
Doch wenn's ein Nachbar sähe,  
Es brücht' mir Schmach und Leid.“—

So geh voraus zur Schenke,  
Und steh nicht vorn am Thor;  
Tritt in den tiefsten Winkel,  
Gewiss, ich hol' dich vor.

Und schwenk' ich dich im Tanze,  
So zieh mir ein Gesicht;  
Dann denken alle Leute,  
Die tanzte lieber nicht!

Und red' ich mit den andern,  
Das mach' dir keine Pein;  
Ich rede mit den andern  
Und denk' auf dich allein.

(p. 82.)

Und willst du gehn nach Hause,  
So warte nicht auf mich;  
Geh fort nur auf dem Steige—  
Gewiss, ich treffe dich.“

last two containing an added thought of the poet's, whose sentimentality accords but ill with the simplicity of the foregoing.

Meinert (p. 127.)

A Knavle gung spozire  
 Ai's Ruosegoetelai;  
 Dos Goetle woer geziret  
 Meit schiener Blumerai.

Ar thot a Resle brache,  
 Zoom Fanster stis ar's nai:  
 Thust schlouffen ober wache  
 Hatzollerlivste main?

De Thire wued derschlouss,  
 Dos Knavlain aigelôn;  
 Ar fond sai Livle waene,  
 Seint Naechte waent se schon.

Wos ziht ar aus dar Tosche?  
 A saidnes Ticherlain:  
 Niem hien, niem hien Hatzlivste!  
 Onn traig dain' Aegerlain.

Müller (p. 138.)

Ein Knäblein ging spaziren  
 Wol um die Abendstund'  
 In einem Rosengarten,  
 Da blühten Blümlein bunt.

Er ging wol auf und nieder  
 Vor eines Gärtners Haus,  
 Da lag ein Mägdlein schöne  
 Zum Fensterlein heraus.

Ein Röslein thilt er brechen,  
 Warf's in das Fensterlein:  
 „Thust schlafen oder wachen,  
 Hertzallerliebste mein?“—

(p. 139.)

„Ich habe nicht geschlafen,  
 Ich habe nicht gewacht,  
 Ich habe nur geträumet,  
 An dich hab' ich gedacht.“—

„Du hast ja auch geweinet,  
 Dein Aeuglein sind so nass;  
 Eine Thrän' fiel aus dem Fenster,  
 Da wuchs eine Ros' im Gras.“—

„Und ist eine Ros' gewachsen,  
 So wuchs sie nur für dich;  
 Und wenn ich hab' geweinet,  
 So weint' ich nur um mich.“

Was zog er aus der Tasche?  
 Ein seidnes Tüchlein:  
 „Nimm hin, Hertzallerliebste,  
 Wisch ab dein' Aeuglein!“

The idea that roses grow from tears, contained in Müller's fifth stanza, does not come from the song of Meinert's, but undoubtedly from the *Wunderhorn: Der Herr am Oelberg*, I, page 285 (for discussion of this cf. *Jour. Germ. Phil.* iii, 49). This second song of Müller's is especially interesting in that it amplifies its model, giving us (except, perhaps, for the two last stanzas of his song, which I have not quoted) what we may regard as his "restoration" of the Volkslied, that is, as it was before it was condensed and sung threadbare—*zersungen*. It is quite in line with the Volkslied usage, as shown in numerous *Gesprächsliedern*, where spirited dialogue is em-

ployed, for both sides to come to expression, instead of but the one, as in the version which Meinert printed. Another point of extreme interest by way of further comparison of the two songs is that Müller purified his material in moulding it, as he did in his *Die Sage vom Frankenberger See bei Aachen*. In the Volkslied, as commonly, the lover is admitted to the bed-chamber of his mistress—a fact omitted in Müller's song. The song of Müller loses, however, by the addition of two stanzas as much as does, for like reason, Eichendorff's *Zerbrochenes Ringlein*.

PHILIP ALLEN.

University of Chicago.

### THE ORIGIN OF THE FRENCH ALEXANDRINE.

IN an article in the eleventh volume of the *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* (pp. 305 ff.) R. Thurneysen endeavors to derive the French ten-syllabled verse from the Latin rhythmical hexameter. His theory, however, has been opposed by G. Paris, *Romania*, xvii, p. 318, and Stengel, *Romanische Verslehre* (*Grundriss*), p. 16, on account of the artificiality and improbability of his proof. This criticism seems to me also at least partly justified, especially by the fact that the types of the hexameter which show the greatest resemblance to the decasyllable are precisely the rarest in rhythmical hexameter verse.

I had often noted a marked resemblance between the hexameter and the alexandrine. But it was not clear to me how I should set to work to prove a direct connection. Thurneysen's article suggested a point of departure.

Stengel praises Thurneysen's effort, "die Umwandlung der Versformen durch die Veränderungen der Sprachformen zu erklären," but adds:

"Kürzungen, wie sie im Innern der Verse nach Th. vorgenommen sein müssten, konnten ohne Zerstörung der auf der festen Silbenzahl beruhenden Versmelodie nur am Reihen- und Versschluss eintreten."

I confess my inability to appreciate this argument, since it is by no means necessary that the musical phrase should correspond exactly, note for syllable, with the verse, but in any case I hope to show that in the transition from hexameter to alexandrine such contractions play no very important rôle.

G. Paris raises a more general objection to Thurneysen's theory in his well-known view that Romance verses are direct continuations of popular Latin forms. But we can neither affirm nor deny that the hexameter was popular in a wider sense. Who knows whether it was not so in that "rustic" literature of which we have so few remains? Indications that it was are brought together by Thurneysen, one of the most important of which I find in his proof that the epic fragment of the *Vita S. Faronis* is preserved in this form. In my opinion it is unnecessary to raise this general question in the derivation of a particular

Romance verse. Rhythmical Latin and Romance poetry lie before us in contact; it is natural to assume a reciprocal influence, which has also been proved in more than one instance (cf. Stengel, *l.c.*, pp. 21 ff.). It is enough, for a rhythmical Latin measure to become the prototype of a Romance verse, that the former be used in the ecclesiastical literature of the early Middle Ages, for was not the church during this period the centre of the mental life of the people, and was not its poetical literature largely, if not created by the people, at least destined for them? What more natural, then, than that, as Thurneysen maintains,

"Romanische Epiker gebrauchten zuerst das Latein, die feierlichste, erhabenste Sprache ihrer Zeit, die der Kirche, der geistlichen Poesie, die offizielle und einzige Schriftsprache"?

But the possibility that the rhythmical hexameter may have served as the model of a Romance verse, has been sufficiently demonstrated by Thurneysen, though his attempt to derive the decasyllable from it did not meet with the approval of scholars. I shall now try to show the probability of the hexameter having served as the prototype of the alexandrine.

I have used, for the rhythmical hexameter, besides the article of Thurneysen, the following collections and investigations of W. Meyer (on which Thurneysen also bases his work):

I. *Radewins Gedicht über Theophilus*, Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. Klasse der kgl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1873, p. 49 ff.

II. *Der Ludus de Antichristo und Bemerkungen über die lateinischen Rhythmen des xii. Jh.*, *ibid.*, 1882, p. 1 ff.

III. *Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung*, Abhandlungen der kgl. bayer. Akademie, I. kl., xvii. Bd., II. Abt., 1884, p. 267 ff.

And for the alexandrine I have considered only the *Voyage de Charlemagne*, the oldest poem extant in this measure, in the third edition of Koschwitz, Leipzig, 1895.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Augustine's *Psalm contra partem Donati* and what he himself writes about it. Quoted by W. Meyer, *Anfang u. Ursprung d. lat. u. griech. rhythmischen Dichtung*, p. 284.





## ALEXANDRINE :

3+3:	(a) — — — — —
	(a <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(a <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —
	(b) — — — — —
	(b <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(b <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —
2+2+2:	(a) — — — — —
	(a <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(a <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —
2+4:	(a) — — — — —
	(a <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(a <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —
4+2:	(a) — — — — —
	(a <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(a <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —
	(b) — — — — —
	(b <sup>1</sup> ) — — — — —
	(b <sup>2</sup> ) — — — — —

It is evident on comparison that of these types 2+2+2 a<sup>1</sup>) = A I b), 2+2+2 a<sup>2</sup>) = A VI b), 4+2 b<sup>1</sup>) = A I a), 4+2 b<sup>2</sup>) = A VI a), and that by reduction of the dactyl in the *Verschluss* 4+2 b<sup>1</sup>) = B III a) and 2+2+2 a<sup>1</sup>) = B III b).

Yet it would be rash to assume that the alexandrine must have derived from these closely resembling types alone. Rather must we take for granted for the earliest period a number of types varying slightly in syllable-number as in the position of the so-called free accents, types which gradually, under the influence of music and of that tendency to systematization which is exemplified throughout the history of French versification, became simplified to the four of the *Voyage de Charlemagne* and eventually to the two types of to-day. It is on the assumption of this early fluctuation that I include in my list of types of the alexandrine hemistichs of eight syllables. The alexandrine of to-day, indeed, fluctuates between 12-13, that of the Old French period between 12-14, the archaic alexandrine, I assume, between 12-16 syllables. But this is not a mere assumption. I submit the following proofs:

1. In the alexandrines of the *Voyage*, in the two important places at the end of each hemistich we have remnants of dactylic ending. I refer to ll. 99, 125, 199, 210, 268, 273, 373, 377,

537, 672, 699, 823, to such words as *milie*, *virgenes*, *Arabie*, *Sirie*, *imagenes*, *angele*, *martirie*. Convincing for me is the fact that these dactyls are preserved only at the ends of hemistichs and that in five-sixths of the cases they occur at the end of the first hemistich. Compare A IV, and A VI. Of course the atonic penultimate no longer counts as a syllable in even these oldest alexandrines, but it must have counted in older times, unless we are to admit that the alexandrine of the *Voyage* has no development behind it. Rather must we agree with Thurneysen when he says:

"Es ist durchaus nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass die streng nach der Silbenzahl geregelten Typen des 11. Jh. nur den Abschluss der Entwicklung darstellen."

2. My second proof I find in Italy. The old Sicilian poet Cielo d'Alcamo has left some verses in an old form of the alexandrine, in which two atonic syllables regularly precede the cæsura:

Rosa fresca aulentissima, c'apar' in ver la state  
Le donne ti disiano pulzelle, maritate;  
Trami deste focora, se teste a bolontate.<sup>4</sup>

The cæsura in the alexandrine is syntactically and rhythmically sharply defined: so, also, is that of the rhythmical hexameter. The position of the cæsura varies, it is true, in the latter, from the fifth to the eighth syllable (average sixth). This variation does not, however, constitute different verses, any more than the penthemimeral and hepthemimeral cæsura of the metrical hexameter. A remnant of this variation and of the consequent inequality of hemistichs is still found in the Old French alexandrine, where, beside 6-6 and 7-7, we have the combinations 6-7 and 7-6. A I and A VI have, indeed, the proper alexandrine cæsura and may have helped on the tendency to symmetry which is manifested in the final form. But it must also be remembered that imitation would be of the verse as a whole, and that such a line as

Bella consurgunt poli præsens sub fine

— — — — — || — — — — —

might easily develop into

— — — — — || — — — — —

<sup>4</sup> Monaci, *Crestomazia*, I, p. 106. According to M. the *contrasto* of Cielo D'Alcamo was composed between 1231 and 1250.

a regular alexandrine type. Such a phenomenon would be analogous to the so-called lyric cæsura and still more to the weak or obliterated cæsura (cf. Stengel, *l.c.*, p. 51 ff.).

There are, including archaic forms, 324 possible types of the regular (classical) alexandrine, most of which are found in the *Voyage de Charlemagne*. There are 252 possible types of the rhythmical hexameter (if we elucidate B IV). No other Latin verse corresponds in this way with the alexandrine.

In conclusion I may be permitted to say that my theory is in accord with the criteria established by scholars for the derivation of Romance measures from Latin models. Diez (*Altroman. Sprachdenkmäler*, p. 126) declares that the imitation must have taken place while the *lingua rustica* was still extant, that the models must have been very popular and that dimensions must correspond. More recently, Beckers, Meyer, Stengel, Thurneysen have shown the necessity of considering as an important factor in the development of Romance verses the changes in language forms. Chronologically, the hexameter is satisfactory, its remains belonging mostly to the seventh and eighth centuries, though extending back to the middle of the third (Commodianus). The correspondence of dimensions I have shown, the slight variations in which are readily explained on the basis of changes in language. There remains the criterion of *Volkstümlichkeit*. This I have tried to show is not a necessary one, but even if it be so regarded, we cannot, in the absence of evidence, reject the hexameter by its authority.

If my hypothesis be accepted, the derivation from the hexameter seems otherwise most natural. The epic verse of Rome was bequeathed with its language to the Romance nations and, in France at least, its continuity is unbroken to the present day. We avoid the absurdity of seeking the origin of a heroic measure in lyric poetry<sup>6</sup>; avoid also the unsatisfactory supposition of more or less conscious

<sup>5</sup> Über den Ursprung der romanischen Versmasse.

<sup>6</sup> L. Gautier's theory of the asclepiad, *Épopées françaises*<sup>2</sup>, i, p. 310. Shared by Bartsch, *Revue critique*, 1866, p. 52 ff., and Tobler, *Versbau*<sup>3</sup>, p. 97, note.

invention<sup>7</sup> and we can agree with Hermann Usener in the fine conclusion to his *All-griechischer Versbau*:

"Forms are not created, but on the contrary they arise and grow. The creative artist does not produce them: he ennobles and transforms what tradition brings him."

#### APPENDIX.

It is with some hesitation that I attempt here a reconstruction of the fragment preserved in the *Vita Sancti Faronis*, after so many scholars of infinitely more knowledge and ability than myself have tried their hand at it. But it seems to me that these verses may conceal not decasyllables, but alexandrines; at all events they seem to turn readily into the latter:

De Lo<sup>8</sup>dier est li chanz, ki fut li reis Francor,  
Ki alat osteler encontre gent Saisson.  
Quant griefinent aeenist as massages Saisons  
Se nen i fust Farons de la gent Borgoignon.

Quant vienent mes Saisson en la terre Francor  
O Farons eret princes . . . . .  
Par deu enort trespassent parmi cite<sup>9</sup> Meldor  
Que ne seient ocis par icel rei Francor.

My indebtedness to previous reconstructions, especially to that of Suchier (cf. *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, xviii, p. 175 ff.) is evident. My changes and additions need no commentary, except perhaps the construction *trespassent parmi*, for which I refer to *Brut*, f. 80 (quoted by Lacurne de St.-Palaye, *Dictionnaire*, art. trespasser); "Parmi la sale trespasserent." If, as Thurneysen shows, the form of these verses as we have them is that of the rhythmical hexameter, and if the original form was, as I have tried to indicate, the alexandrine, two points are proved:

1. That Hildegarius regarded the rhythmical hexameter as the Latin counterpart of the alexandrine.

2. That the alexandrine appears as an immediate contemporary of the rhythmical hexameter, and older, so far as can be determined, than the decasyllable, of which it cannot, therefore, be taken as a secondary expansion.

F. J. A. DAVIDSON.

University of Cincinnati.

<sup>7</sup> Diez, *Altroman. Sprachd.*, pp. 129, 130. Supported by ten Brink, *Coniectanea in historiam rei metricæ francogallicæ*, p. 33; Thurneysen, *l.c.*, p. 305; Stengel, *l.c.*, p. 21.

# NOTES ON TRANSVERSE ALLITERATION.

IN his article on "Transverse Alliteration in Teutonic Poetry" in the last number of *The Journal of Germanic Philology* (Vol. iii, No. 2), Professor Emerson shows not only by precept, but also by example, the dangers of introducing the mathematics of probabilities into philological studies. He exposes Frucht's error clearly enough, but in doing so it seems to me that he falls into much more serious errors himself.

The question is whether, in alliterative lines of the form *abab* or *baab*, the *b*-alliteration was introduced by accident or by design. Frucht has argued that such alliteration is found in Teutonic poetry much less often than it would be likely to occur if it were left to mere chance. His contention is that as there are 18 consonants and (for the purposes of alliteration) one vowel-initial, the chance of transverse alliteration is 1:19.

Emerson points out that some kinds of alliteration are antecedently more probable than others. For alliterative purposes there are at least 25 possible initials, 7 vowels and 18 consonants; and any vowel may alliterate with any other. The fact is obvious enough, but Emerson draws a surprising conclusion from it. It should, of course, be regarded as strengthening Frucht's argument. This will be clear if we consider a less complex problem of a similar nature. With an ordinary pair of dice, the chance of throwing a doublet in a single throw is 1:6, and in a long succession of throws it is probable that doublets will be thrown about one-sixth of the time. But suppose the dice are made with sixes on two faces instead of only one: a simple calculation will show that the chance of throwing doublets is then increased from 1:6 to 2:9, and it is perfectly clear that the more changes of this sort are made in the dice, the more frequently may we expect to throw doublets in a long series of throws. So in the problem of transverse alliteration: if we assume that vowels occur as initial letters with a frequency indicated by the ratio 7:25, and that each consonant's ratio is 1:25, it may easily be shown that the chance of alliteration is not less than 1:19, as Emerson assumes, but much greater.

There will be 625 possible ways of pairing the 25 initials, and of these 18 will give consonant alliteration, and 49 vowel alliteration. The chance of occurrence of one or the other will therefore be 67:625, or 1:933/100. In other words, Frucht's error resulted in his understating his case, and Emerson's exposure of it strengthens the argument.

Emerson pursues another line of argument which, he thinks, leads Frucht's reasoning into a *reductio ad absurdum*. He has studied all the lines in *Beowulf* of the types *axay* and *xaay*, and noted the relative frequency of certain consonants in the positions *x* and *y*.

"In the 104 lines in which *m* stands in place of *x*, *s* is found in the position of *y* 29 times, or in the ratio of 1:4. In the 42 lines in which *st* is in the place of *x*, *s* is in position of *y* 5 times, giving a ratio of 1:8. In the first 500 lines of *Beowulf*, *s* occurs as the initial of the fourth stressed syllable 93 times, or about once in five times. These examples might be multiplied at pleasure. They are not exceptional in any sense, and are utterly at variance with the ratio of accidental occurrence set up by Frucht."

Emerson's inference, as I understand it, is, in the first place, that Frucht's ratio of 1:19 is not exact, and in the second place, that the same sort of reasoning would lead us to suppose that the poet or poets of *Beowulf* had a special fondness for using initial *s* in lines in which initial *m* also occurred, which is absurd. This part of the argument is not distinctly stated, but as Emerson calls it a *reductio ad absurdum*, I think this must be what he means.

The first part of the argument is of no importance, for, as I have already indicated, it is far from being essential to Frucht's argument that the ratio of 1:19 should be exact. The second part, as I understand it, is inapplicable because it introduces an entirely different kind of reasoning. Let us again consider the matter of the dice. If I throw two dice 600 times in succession, the chances are that I shall throw doublets about 100 times; but if in fact I get doublets 125 times, would anybody say that the dice were conclusively proved to be "loaded?" On the other hand, if I get doublets considerably less than 100 times, would not anybody be fairly satisfied that the dice were *not* loaded for doublets? It is clear that the argument must not be expected to



work both ways. It will be worth while, also, to reflect that in cases of this sort we must consider the antecedent probability of the state of things about which we are speculating. If, for example, I have obtained my dice from a backgammon board in a gentleman's house, I think I might throw doublets 150 times without suspecting treachery; but if I have found them in a gambling dive, it would take only a very slight excess above the probable 100 to make me suspicious.

So in the matter in hand: if Frucht finds that transverse alliteration occurs very much less frequently than would be probable if it were left to mere chance, is it not perfectly clear that the dice are *not* loaded? But on the other hand, what possible conclusion can we deduce from the suggestion that initial *s* occurs oftener in lines which elsewhere have an initial *m* than chance would lead us to expect? This is a case in which we can conceive of no reason for believing that the dice *are* loaded, and we shall therefore regard the phenomenon as a freak of fortune, until we find that the disproportion in the figures is quite overwhelming. As it is, there is in the figures that Emerson gives nothing that seems particularly surprising to one familiar with the statistics of runs of luck.

But before we can arrive at any just conclusion about the whole matter, there are other considerations to be weighed. Let us imagine some critic of the future considering whether the two riming lines in *The Tempest* were introduced by accident or by design. It might be possible, by an elaborate tabulation of final sounds, to determine just how often mere chance should bring about a rime in blank verse, if the poet paid absolutely no attention to it. Suppose, for the sake of illustration, that in a play of the length of *The Tempest*, rime might be expected to occur, under such circumstances, about ten times. It would then be perfectly clear, I think, that Shakespeare was not, in general, seeking rime; but would it not still be absurd to say that where he did use rime he used it unintentionally?

Now it seems to me that Frucht is clearly right in arguing that our Old English poets did not, in general, seek transverse allitera-

tion. But this is a very different thing from saying that where they did use it they did so by inadvertence. Frucht's figures seem to me to show conclusively that they, in general, avoided it, just as any writer of modern blank verse consciously avoids rime; but it seems almost equally clear, from the fact that transverse alliteration does, nevertheless, occur pretty frequently, that they thought it useful as an occasional ornament of their verse, just as Shakespeare, even in his later plays, liked the sound of an occasional rime. I feel slightly strengthened in this opinion by the fact stated by Emerson, that transverse alliteration occurs much oftener in the form *abab* than in the form *baab*. If the phenomenon were due to mere chance, I can see no reason why one form should be commoner than the other. If, on the other hand, it was generally avoided, but was sometimes purposely admitted, then it might easily happen that one form, being more agreeable to the ear, would occur more frequently than the others. Here, however, a certain caution must be observed. Transverse alliteration of the form *abab* can occur only in lines of the form *axay*; and *baab*, in like manner, presupposes *xaay*. Now do the assertions quoted by Emerson mean only that *abab* is absolutely more common than *baab*, or that the former is more frequent in proportion to the *axay* lines? This would certainly be a legitimate subject for computation.

The whole discussion shows not that the mathematical theory of probabilities is inapplicable to investigations of this sort, but that its use is fraught with many perils. Even technical treatises on the subject not infrequently contain serious blunders, for the investigator who can find his way through the complicated mathematical processes that the subject necessitates is still in danger of erring through failure to take into consideration some all-important factor of antecedent probability. I do not, of course, flatter myself that Mr. Emerson will find even my own arguments impregnable; but neither do I think that the dangers of the method ought to discourage a courageous student from attempting it.

CHARLTON M. LEWIS.

Yale University.



THE FOLK-LORE ELEMENTS IN  
HAUPTMANN'S "DIE VERSUN-  
KENE GLOCKE."

I.

EVER since Hauptmann's great fairy-play appeared, have the critics been busy hunting up sources and pointing out parallels. But they confined themselves almost entirely to works of literature, from Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* down to Halm's *Griseldis* and Wagner's *Tannhäuser*. Where literary models were lacking, the critics were content to say that Hauptmann drew upon the folk-lore of his own Silesian mountains. Some, indeed, claimed that the supernatural beings were partly creations of the poet's own imagination, partly taken from Classical mythology or suggested by Arnold Böcklin's wonderful pictures. In the following I shall try to show how much of Hauptmann's play goes back to popular traditions. Perhaps we shall find that the poet is far more indebted to German folk-lore than to all the works of literature pointed out by the critics.

Even the superficial reader must be struck with the astonishing amount of fairy-lore found in the play. I refer here not so much to the principal characters like Rautendelein, the *Nickelmann*, the *Schrat*, as to the numerous references and allusions to popular traditions and superstitions of every kind. Indeed, one of the main reasons why the play proved almost a failure on the American stage is the fact that to the average American audience fairy-lore in such quantity is unintelligible and bewildering. Mr. Meltzer, in the introduction to his translation of the play, very justly remarks that some knowledge of German folk-lore is a pre-requisite for the correct understanding of the play. He supposes that Hauptmann himself must have carefully studied Grimm's German Mythology.

How did Hauptmann come by this thorough knowledge of German folk-lore? Is Mr. Meltzer's surmise correct, or did the poet get his folk-lore from the peasants of Silesia, or did he draw upon his own imagination? Schlenther, in his book on Hauptmann (p. 188 ff.) tells us what preparations the poet made for his *Florian Geyer*. He not only studied the history of the man but also the historical

*milieu*. He visited the country where the chief events in Geyer's life took place. He made himself so familiar with the language of the sixteenth century that a scholar like Max Herrmann of Berlin, a specialist in German sixteenth century literature, can find little fault with style and vocabulary.<sup>1</sup> The same method, I believe, Hauptmann employed in preparing his fairy-play. To get the *milieu* for his sprites he made a systematic study of folk-lore, German folk-lore in particular. An inexhaustive mine of German folk-lore is furnished by the works of the two Grimms, and to these works Hauptmann must have turned first of all, especially to Jacob Grimm's German Mythology, and to the *Kindermärchen*. There are other rich store-houses of German folk-lore with which the poet must have familiarized himself. He may, of course, also have utilized personal recollections of popular tales and traditions heard in Silesia and elsewhere.

The poet must not be expected to use his material as a scholar would. As long as the inner truth is not violated, his sovereign imagination may disregard what the scholars call facts. An analysis of the folk-lore elements in *Die Versunkene Glocke* will show that Hauptmann did not always follow the traditions as he found them, but modified and combined them to suit his purpose.

I. DIE ALTE WITTICHEN.

Where did Hauptmann get the character of the *Buschgrossmutter*? Is *die alte Wittichen* in the main a creation of his own imagination? The name *Buschgrossmutter* Hauptmann found in Grimm's Mythology (*D. M.* 4, p. 400). It denotes, in the region of the river Saale, a female wood-sprite exercising authority over the *Moosfräulein*. Simrock (*D. M.* 3, p. 423) calls the *Buschgrossmutter* the queen of the wood-sprites and compares her with Berchta. *Die Wittichen* occupies a very similar position in the play: she rules over the *Holzmännerchen* and *Holzweiberchen*—the latter strictly correspond to the *Moosfräulein*—she is respected and feared even by the *Nickelmann* and the *Schrat*, bat and squirrel listen to her command. *Die Wittichen* has snow-white, loose

<sup>1</sup> Schlenther, G. Hauptmann, p. 267. *Jahresbericht für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte*, 1896, 1, 7, 15. Cf. also M. Osborn, *Ibid.*, 11, 1, 35.

hair and ugly features. Her appearance is that of all the mysterious old women living in the forest. The *Buschmutter* in Silesia is an ugly old woman with disheveled hair and torn clothes supporting herself with a crutch.<sup>2</sup> The *Buschweibchen* in Bohemia has snow-white loose hair and uses a *Knotenstock*.<sup>3</sup> The *Buschweibchen* in Austria<sup>4</sup> is a *steinaltet tiefgebücktes Mütterchen* with long snow-white hair. Though in the play the use of a crutch is not expressly mentioned, we may infer it from the phrase: *Kommt gehumpelt* (sc. *die Wittichen*, act I). On the stage of the *Deutsche Theater* at Berlin, *Wittichen* always appears with a crutch.

*Die Wittichen* also partakes of the character of the *Waldfrau*, the lonely old woman living in the forest, an object of suspicion to ordinary human beings. In the *Waldfrau* the human side is more prominent than in the *Buschmutter* or the *Buschweibchen*. The opening lines of one of Grimm's *Märchen* (*K. M.*, No. 179) picture to us the typical *Waldfrau*:

"Es war einmal ein steinaltes mütterchen, das lebte mit einer herde gänse in einer einöde zwischen bergen und hatte da ein kleines haus. die einöde war von einem grossen wald umgeben und jeden morgen nahm die alte ihre krücke und wackelte in den wald. das mütterchen sammelte gras für seine gänse, brach sich das wilde obst ab . . . und trug alles auf seinem rücken heim. man hätte meinen sollen, die schwere last müsste sie zu boden drücken, aber sie brachte sie immer glücklich nach hause. . . . die leute begegneten ihr nicht gern und nahmen lieber einen umweg, und wenn ein vater mit seinem knaben an ihr vorüberging, so sprach er leise zu ihm 'nimm dich in acht vor der alten, . . . es ist eine hexe.'"

There is a striking similarity between this scene and the one in the first act where *die Wittichen* enters almost succumbing to the load on her back. The landscape is much the same; instead of the brook in Grimm's tale we have a well. The geese seem to be a feature of the home of *die Wittichen*, too; for Rautendein calls a gander to aid her in driving away the bee. Is it a mere accident that the geese in Grimm's tale cry *wulle*, *wulle*, the cry with which Rautendein calls

<sup>2</sup> Peter, *Volkstümliches aus Oestreichisch-Schlesien*. Tropaupau 1865, I, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte* I, 86.

<sup>4</sup> Vernalcken, *Mythen und Bräuche des Volkes in Oestreich*, Wien 1859, p. 242.

the gander, and that, only a few lines further on, Grimm uses the word *trulle* which Rautendein jestingly applies to herself in the opening scene? Even if one is not ready to admit a direct connection between the two scenes, he must admit that the poet has put before us a genuine *Märchenscene*. The *Waldfrau* in the tale just quoted, and in other tales, is, in the eyes of the world, a witch. *Die Wittichen*, too, is considered a witch. The barber (act I) counts up all the mischief she might do to the people in the valley, if provoked. It is the sort of thing told of witches: they cause the cows to give blood instead of milk,<sup>5</sup> they inflict all sorts of diseases upon men and animals,<sup>6</sup> they twist the hair of children and grown people into elf locks,<sup>7</sup> they have the "evil eye,"<sup>8</sup> against which the barber protects himself with the sign of the cross.<sup>9</sup> The barber calls *die Wittichen* names that are generally given to witches: "verfluchte Katze," "verdammtes Wetteraas;" the schoolmaster calls her "Donneraas." The cat is not only the companion of the witches, but also the animal whose form they often assume.<sup>10</sup> *Die Wittichen* herself has a cat (act I). The names *Wetteraas* and *Donneraas*, which Hauptmann probably got from Grimm (*D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 254), primarily refer to cats. The barber compares *die Wittichen* with a toad, an animal which is often thought to be a witch in transformation.<sup>11</sup> *Die Wittichen*, according to the barber, has red eyes; witches are generally known by their red eyes.<sup>12</sup> Like the *Waldfrau* or *weise Frau*, *die Wittichen* possesses the power to grant wishes, which she exercises in the last act. She appears to be gruff, but in reality is kind, just as the *Waldfrau* in the fairy-tale often seems hostile at first, but turns out to be the friend of the simple-hearted.

<sup>5</sup> Grabinski, *Die Sagen, der Aberglaube, etc., in Schlesien*, Schweidnitz 1886, p. 38; Peter, *Volkstaml. aus Oestr. Schl.* II, 253; Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 897; Wuttke, *Deutscher Volks- aberglaube*, § 389.

<sup>6</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> pp. 898, 920; Wuttke, §§ 389-396.

<sup>7</sup> Wuttke, §§ 220, 523.

<sup>8</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 920; Wuttke, § 214.

<sup>9</sup> Wuttke, §§ 411, 418.

<sup>10</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 254; Kuhn und Schwartz, *Nord-deutsche Sagen*, p. 539; Köhler, *Volksbrauch im Voigtland*, p. 174; Simrock, *D. M.*,<sup>3</sup> p. 459.

<sup>11</sup> Rochholz, *Schweizersagen des Aargaus*, 2, 188.

<sup>12</sup> Wuttke, § 213; Rochholz, *Schweizersagen* I, p. 82.

We see that the character of *die Wittichen* is, even in minute details, based upon German folk-lore; Hauptmann has combined different traditions about the *Buschgrossmutter* or *Buschweibchen*, the *Waldfrau* and the witches. Like her prototypes, she is both supernatural and human. She is a mysterious person. But she has something not found in German folk-lore: she has the true religion, that harmony of faith and intelligence, that inner peace which few can possess and which Heinrich in vain strives to obtain. In her heart God and Nature are one. She stands, as Schlenther justly remarks,<sup>13</sup> above the heathen gods as well as above the Christianity of the people in the valley. She is, figuratively speaking, the priestess of the *Sonnenmutter*.

## 2. THE NICKELMANN.

Where did Hauptmann find the material for his *Nickelmann*? Adolf Hauften<sup>14</sup> maintains that

"Hauptmann's sinnbildlich aufzufassende . . . gestalten sind in der entzückenden ausführung der einzelheiten freieste erfindung des dichters, im grossen ganzen hingegen zweifellos angeregt durch die farbenfreudigen, lebensstrotzenden, humorvollen schöpfungen Böcklins und durch antike mythen."

This he thinks to be especially true of the *Waldschrat* and the *Nickelmann*. The latter reminds him of Nereus and his daughters, and has, he claims, no special connection with Silesian or other German traditions about the *Wassermann*.

The water-sprite is called the *Nickelmann* in different parts of Germany;<sup>15</sup> the name also occurs in a ballad.<sup>16</sup> Hauptmann's description of the *Nickelmann* is as follows: "ein Wassergreis, Schilf im Haar, triefend von Nässe, lang ausschneufend wie ein Seehund. Er zwinkert mit den Augen, bis er sich an das Tageslicht gewöhnt hat."

In the fifth act the *Schrat* calls him 'Froschkönig,' 'Wasserpatscher,' 'Grünbauch.' From the phrase "und kraute dir den Bart" in the same act we must conclude that *Nickelmann*

has a beard. In German popular traditions the water-sprites appear in various forms, but there are many traditions which give to the *Wassermann* practically the same attributes as Hauptmann. Grimm<sup>17</sup> states that the *Wassermann* is generally old and long-bearded; in Saxony<sup>18</sup> and other parts of Northern Germany<sup>19</sup> he is thought of as an old man. With Hauptmann he is "ein tausendjähr'ger." In Lower Austria the *Wassermann* was thought to wear reeds instead of hair,<sup>20</sup> in Andersen's fairy-tales<sup>21</sup> we also find a *Wassermann* with reeds in his hair. Nixies are often thought to wear a wreath of reeds, the *Bartschnixe* in Silesia appeared with such a headgear at a dance.<sup>22</sup> Water is supposed to be constantly dripping from the *Wassermann's* hair.<sup>23</sup> The same is told about the nixies.<sup>24</sup> Hauptmann's water-sprite puffs like a seal and winks his eyes until used to the daylight. These traits, so far as I am aware, are not found in German traditions. They were doubtless suggested by Böcklin's paintings. The names *Froschkönig* and *Wasserpatscher* Hauptmann got from Grimm's tale *Der Froschkönig oder der eiserne Heinrich*, where both occur.<sup>25</sup> *Grünbauch* is a fitting epithet, as the *Wassermann* is sometimes represented with a green body,<sup>26</sup> or at least dressed in green.<sup>27</sup> Hauptmann nowhere implies that the *Nickelmann* is either of gigantic stature or of diminutive size. Both types occur in German tradition, but the third type, of ordinary human stature, is perhaps the most common.<sup>28</sup>

The *Nickelmann* is visible only down to his waist. This trait is found in several traditions. In some parts of Austria the *Wassermann* is

<sup>17</sup> D. M., 4 p. 406.

<sup>18</sup> Grässe, *Sagenschatz des Königreichs Sachsen*, I, 147.

<sup>19</sup> Kuhn und Schwartz, *Nordd. Sg.*, No. 105.

<sup>20</sup> Vernaleken, *Mythen und Bräuche in Oestreich*, p. 164.

<sup>21</sup> *Sammtliche Märchen*, p. 719; *Die Glockentiefe*.

<sup>22</sup> Goedsche, *Schlesischer Sagen-, Historien- und Legendenschatz*, Meissen 1840, p. 88. Cf. also Witzschel, *Thüringer Sagen*, I, 236.

<sup>23</sup> Vernaleken, *ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>24</sup> Witzschel, *ibid.*, I, 279.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also Henkel in *Zschr. f. d. deutsch. Unterricht*, xiii, 256.

<sup>26</sup> Vernaleken, *ibid.*, p. 162.

<sup>27</sup> Reuper, *Schlesische Sagen und Märchen*, Wien, 1881, p. 40; Vernaleken, *ibid.*, p. 164.

<sup>28</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 49; Kuhn und Schwartz, *ibid.*, No. 197, 5; Golther, *Germ. Myth.*, p. 146.

<sup>13</sup> G. Hauptmann, p. 263.

<sup>14</sup> *Zur Kunde vom Wassermann, Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte. Festgabe für Richard Heinzel*.

<sup>15</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*, 4 p. 404.

<sup>16</sup> Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Schlesische Volkslieder*, Leipzig, 1842, No. 1, note.



thought to stand in the water up to his waist.<sup>29</sup> Kuhn<sup>30</sup> tells of a *Wasserschmied* who hammers and forges standing in the water up to his belt; a nixie in the Saale is visible only as far as her waist.<sup>31</sup> None of the legends just quoted imply that the body of the water-sprite ended in a fish-tail; to assume this in the case of the *Nickelmann* is perfectly gratuitous. There are a few German traditions attributing to the water-sprite a fish-tail,<sup>32</sup> but in the large majority of cases these sprites are represented with human extremities.<sup>33</sup>

The character of the *Nickelmann*, too, finds its counterpart in the *Wassermann* of popular traditions. *Nickelmann* is deeply in love with Rautendelein. The *Wassermann* of popular tradition also appears as a lover, and though he makes no sentimental appeals to his loved one, he is just as eager to possess her as the *Nickelmann*. He will sometimes assume the form of a handsome young man, dance with one of the lasses of the village, and then take her down into his watery abode.<sup>34</sup> The best example of his love-making is found in the ballad called *Des Wassermann's Braut* or *Das schöne Hannele*.<sup>35</sup> Here the *Wassermann* appears as suitor of a maiden who finally follows him down into the water to be his wife.<sup>36</sup> The character of the *Wassermann* in popular tradition is not without a trait of great cruelty.<sup>37</sup> *Nickelmann* shows the cruelty of his race when he threatens to punish Hornig (act 3): "den Kopf dreh ich ihm ab." In a popular tale the *Wassermann* says to a fisherman who offended him: "so drehe ich dir den Hals um."<sup>38</sup> Witzschel relates a Thuringian legend,<sup>39</sup> in which the *Wassermann* wants to wrench off the neck of a woman who attended his own wife in child-birth. *Nickelmann* also

threatens to bite off Heinrich's throat (act III). This may have been suggested by the fact that the *Wassermann* is sometimes represented as having long, sharp teeth.<sup>40</sup> The philosophy and wisdom of the *Nickelmann* are not taken directly from popular tradition, but they resemble in a certain degree the gift of prophecy often attributed to water-sprites.<sup>41</sup> The words of warning addressed to Rautendelein at the end of the first act and the ominous lines directed against sleeping Heinrich (Act V) show him to be a prophet who knows the future. Critics generally agree that the character of the *Nickelmann* is inconsistent. This inconsistency, I believe, is due to some extent to the varying character of the *Wassermann* in popular tradition; and it is this tradition which furnished Hauptmann with the material for his *Nickelmann*. But it is a difficult task to make a consistent poetic character out of a sprite, the product of primitive imagination, who in different legends shows traits of great amorousness, excessive cruelty and supernatural wisdom. Even sentimentality, though of a different kind from that of the *Nickelmann*, is not foreign to the *Wassermann* of popular tradition. Grimm<sup>42</sup> relates the beautiful legend of Neck, the Swedish water-sprite, who mourns and weeps at the thought that there is no salvation for him.

A few minor points may be added to show how closely Hauptmann followed German traditions. Rautendelein offers *Nickelmann* a black cock (Act I). Grimm reports that the *Nickelmann* in the Bode received an annual gift of a black cock.<sup>43</sup> The *Nickelmann* has daughters; the *Wassermann* in popular traditions is often accompanied by his grown-up daughters.<sup>44</sup> The *Nickelmann* speaks of his youngest daughter as "grünhaarig" (Act IV); water-sprites, male and female, are often said to have green hair.<sup>45</sup> *Nickelmann* has a splendid hall under the water, like so many

<sup>29</sup> Vernaleken, p. 164.

<sup>30</sup> *Westfälische Sagen*, I, 47.

<sup>31</sup> Witzschel, I, 239. Cf. Simrock, *D. M.* 3, p. 429.

<sup>32</sup> Kuhn und Schwartz, No. 197, I; Vernaleken, *ibid.*, p. 164; Schambach-Müller, *Niedersächsische Sagen*, p. 66.

<sup>33</sup> Golther, *Germ. Myth.*, p. 147; Weinhold, *Beitr. zur Nixenkunde*, *Zschr. d. V. f. Volkskunde*, v, p. 122.

<sup>34</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 51.

<sup>35</sup> Hoffmann v. Fallersleben, *Schlesische Volkslieder*, No. 1; Erk-Böhme, *Dtsch. Liederhort*, I, p. 1, ff.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. also Goethe, *Die Fischerin*.

<sup>37</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*, 4 p. 409; Simrock, *D. M.* 3, p. 429.

<sup>38</sup> Kuhn und Schwartz, *Nordd. Sg.*, No. 197, 2.

<sup>39</sup> *Thüringer Sg.*, I, 202; Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 49.

<sup>40</sup> Kuhn und Schwartz, No. 197, 1.

<sup>41</sup> Golther, *Germ. Myth.*, p. 149; Grimm, *D. M.*, 4 III, p. 142.

<sup>42</sup> *D. M.*, 4 p. 408.

<sup>43</sup> *D. M.*, 4 III, p. 143; Kuhn und Schwartz, *Nordd. Sg.*, No. 197, 1.

<sup>44</sup> Witzschel, *Thüringer Sg.*, II, 80; Grisse, *Sg. d. K. s. Sachsen*, I, 147, 279; Ziehnert, *Sachsens Volksagen*, p. 402.

<sup>45</sup> Meyer, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 147; Vernaleken, *Mythen und Bräuche*, p. 162; Grisse, *ibid.*, II, 100.



water-sprites<sup>46</sup>. He has power over the water<sup>47</sup> (Act IV). The *Nickelmann* is, in short, a thoroughly German water-sprite; Hauffen's view in regard to his origin is untenable.

### 3. THE WALDSCHRAT.

Is the *Waldschrat* a German sprite, or is he an antique satyr? The name *Schrat* is thoroughly German, whatever its origin may be.<sup>48</sup> It may be applied to almost any sort of demoniac being.<sup>49</sup> The compound *Waldschrat* Hauptmann got from Grimm,<sup>50</sup> who cites the Latin equivalents *pilosus*, *satyrus*, found in glosses and elsewhere. Such glosses, however, do not prove that the German *Waldschrat* in every way resembled the classical satyr.<sup>51</sup> Hauptmann's *Waldschrat* is *bocksbeinig*, *ziegenbärtig*, *gehört* (Act I), *stark von Lenden* (Act V); he is characterized by extreme sensuality and an irrepressible desire to do mischief of every sort. Do we find such a sprite in German folk-lore? German wood-sprites are generally thought to have their bodies all covered with hair,<sup>52</sup> and to be of great physical strength.<sup>53</sup> We also find sprites with feet shaped like those of the goat,<sup>54</sup> but nowhere in German folk-lore do we meet with a sprite having horns, legs and a beard like a goat. These characteristics are reserved for the devil. Mannhardt, who ransacked the whole of Europe to get evidence for his theory regarding the worship of demons of vegetation, does not give a single instance of a German sprite shaped like Hauptmann's *Waldschrat*; nor does Grimm, or any collection of German folk-lore, mention such a sprite, so far as I am aware. Mannhardt has much to say about demons in the shape of a goat found

in Germanic Europe, but they are theriomorphic deities and not beings half man, half goat.<sup>55</sup> Hauffen's statement is, therefore, correct: Hauptmann's *Waldschrat* is not drawn from German traditions, but is a true satyr or faun. The *Waldschrat's* sensuality is distinctly that of the satyr. German wood-sprites, though more or less given to love affairs with human beings,<sup>56</sup> do not show such exuberant animal spirits. The *Waldschrat* dances or tries to dance with Rautendelein and the elves, just as the satyr dances with the nymphs; both live in the mountains.<sup>57</sup>

Bartels has pointed out that Goethe's *Satyros oder der vergötterte Waldteufel* had influence upon Hauptmann's *Waldschrat*. There can be no doubt that the mad words with which the *Waldschrat* interrupts the dance of the fairies (Act I), are directly traceable to ll. 31-37 of Goethe's *Satyros* (Weimar ed. xvi, p. 77 ff.) The flies which *die Wittichen* threatens to send after him are also found in Goethe's poem (l. 97), where *Satyros* complains of the "Unzahl verfluchter Mücken." Like Goethe's *Satyros* (l. 76 ff.) the *Waldschrat* delights in drinking the milk of the goats directly from the udder<sup>58</sup> (Act I). These traits are not found in German traditions, though German forest-sprites sometimes appear as goat-herds or cow-herds.<sup>59</sup> The *Waldschrat's* mischievousness is also characteristic of the satyr or faun. Preller (*l.c.*) compares the tricks of Faunus to those of Rübezahl. The faun causes the echo and other mysterious noises of the forest. Hauptmann's *Waldschrat* cries out *echohaft* (Act I). Before he appears on the scene, his cry *holdrio ho* is heard, just as Goethe's *Satyros* announces himself with a series of yells.

<sup>55</sup> *W. und F. Kulte*, II, Chap. III, §§ 10 and 12.

<sup>56</sup> Golther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 154.

<sup>57</sup> As for the satyr and faun, cf. Preller, *Röm. Mythol.*,<sup>2</sup> Berlin, 1865, p. 335; Welcker, *Griech. Götterlehre*, Göttingen, 1857, II, p. 636, and III, p. 50; Mannhardt, *W. und F. Kulte*, II, pp. 114, 131, 138.

<sup>58</sup> This is also told of the Russian forest-spirit, *Ljeschie*, who closely resembles the Classical satyr, cf. Mannhardt, *ibid.*, I, p. 140, and of the *Skrats* among the Island-Swedes along the coast of Russia, cf. Mannhardt, *Germ. Mythen*, Berlin, 1855, p. 53. Elves and goblins generally like milk; Mannhardt, *Germ. Mythen*, p. 52; Kuhn und Schwartz, *Nordd. Sg.*, No. 322; Mogk in Paul's *Grundriss*, I, p. 1036.

<sup>59</sup> Mannhardt, *W. und F. Kulte*, II, p. 149; Rochholz, *Schweizersagen*, I, p. 319.

<sup>46</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 52; Golther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 147; Wuttke, § 54; Vernaleken, *l.c.*, pp. 133, 162.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Panzer, *Beitr. z. dtsch. Myth.* I, 276.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Grimm, *D. W.*, s. v. *Schrat*; Weinhold, *Die Riesen des germanischen Mythos*, p. 268.

<sup>49</sup> Golther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 126.

<sup>50</sup> *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 396; cf. also Mannhardt, *W. und F. Kulte* I, 114.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Mannhardt, *ibid.* I, 114.

<sup>52</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> pp. 397, 400; Rochholz, *Schweizersagen*, I, 319; Golther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 153.

<sup>53</sup> Mannhardt, *W. und F. Kulte* II, 149.

<sup>54</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 372, n. 3; Rochholz, *Naturmythen*, pp. 103, 105, 123; Mannhardt, *l.c.* II, 152; St. ber, *Sg. des Elsasses*, p. 4.

The *Waldschrat*, according to *die Wittichen* (Act I), leads travelers astray. That is characteristic of forest-sprites generally,<sup>60</sup> but it is significant that Grimm, on the same page where he speaks of the *Waldschrat* (*D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 397), relates the Moravian legend of the *Sechirte*:

"ein schadenfroher geist, der in gestalt eines hirten, die peitsche in der hand, reisende in einen moorbruch verlockt."

As the word *Reisender* is often applied to a *Handwerksbursche*, we have here doubtless the origin of the words of *die Wittichen*:

"an Handwerksburscha ei 's Moor verfiern,  
doas a muss Hoals und Bene verlieren."

In the same passage *die Wittichen* reproaches the *Waldschrat* with upsetting a load of glass to vex some poor mountaineer. Just such a story is told of Rübezahl.<sup>61</sup>

Other German traits of the *Waldschrat* are referred to by Rautendelein when she tauntingly says to him: "Jage du deine Moosweiblein." The *Waldschrat* appears here in the rôle of the Wild Huntsman. It is a widely spread tradition that the *Moosweibchen* are pursued and killed by the Wild Huntsman.<sup>62</sup> This tradition Hauptmann has quite arbitrarily connected with his *Waldschrat*. What the rest of Rautendelein's taunt signifies is not clear. Though popular traditions mention female wood-sprites with children,<sup>63</sup> no mention is made of a *Frau Schrat*, nor is such a prolific marriage on record in German folk-lore, so far as I am aware. Hauptmann probably drew upon his imagination to illustrate the sensual nature of his wood-sprite. The idea may possibly have been suggested by the German tradition attributing to female wood-sprites very long breasts, the symbol of fertility.<sup>64</sup> Mannhardt<sup>65</sup> mentions a satyr-shaped mountain-spirit in Scotland, who has 12,000 wives and children.

The *Waldschrat* furthermore detests bread

60 Mannhardt, *W. und F. Kulte*, i, 129, 139; ii, 114.

61 Klose, *Führer durch die Sagen und Märchenwelt des Riesengebirges*, Schweidnitz, 1887, p. 118.

62 Grimm, *D. S.*, Nos. 47, 48; Mannhardt, *ibid.*, i, 82; Wuttke, § 16; Panzer, *Beitr.* ii, 69.

63 Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 400; Wuttke, § 52; Mannhardt, *ibid.*, i, 88 and ii, 147.

64 Mannhardt, *ibid.*, i, 147 n.; Gölther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 153.

65 *ibid.*, ii, 153.

baked with caraway-seed (Act I), a trait common to German sprites.<sup>66</sup> He wants to stamp into the ground *Masslieb und Vergissnichtmein*, the flowers of true love;<sup>67</sup> the elves on the other hand do not wish even to touch these flowers with their feet (Act I). The *Waldschrat* asks Rautendelein to follow him into the bushes:

"dort ist 'ne Weide, alt und ausgehöhlt,  
die Hahnkrat nie gehört und Wasserrauschen:  
dort will ich dir das Wunderpfeiflein schneiden,  
danach sie alle tanzen."

This seems like a reference to the *syrix*, the pipe of Pan and the satyrs, but it is not a Classical allusion. Grimm (*D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 1039) relates the following Russian superstition:

"um eine wunderbare pfeife zu erlangen, die alle leute tanzen mache, müsse man im dunkeln wald die grüne weide aufsuchen, welche niemals wasser rauschen noch den hahn krähen hörte."

The *Schrat's* words are almost literally taken from this passage. As it is spring during the first act,—cf. Rautendelein's words "es riecht nach Frühling"—the allusion to *Pfeiflein schneiden* is very appropriate. It is a general practice of German boys to go out in spring and make whistles out of willow-bark, repeating, at the same time, all sorts of charms.<sup>68</sup> The other meaning of *Pfeiflein* in this passage is fairly common during the sixteenth century.<sup>69</sup>

The *Waldschrat* pulls out a short pipe and lights it with a match. This grotesque scene is apt to strike one as very original; Hauptmann, however, follows German traditions. A goblin with pipe in mouth is by no means unknown to German folk-lore. The ever active imagination of a people to whom the old traditions are sacred, seizes upon every new invention and throws around it the poetic halo of superstition. A good example is furnished by the railways, around which sprang up about the middle of the nineteenth century many curious traditions and superstitions.

66 Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> 3, 141; Prühle, *Harzsagen*, i, 48; Perger, *Deutsche Pflanzensagen*, p. 201.

67 Perger, *ibid.*, pp. 131, 171; M. v. Strantz, *Die Blumen in Sage und Geschichte*, Berlin, 1875, pp. 224, 345.

68 Peter, *Volkstümliches aus Östr.-Schlesien*, i, p. 148 f., gives several such charms in the Silesian dialect.

69 Grimm, *D. W.* s. v. pfeife; Val. Schumann *Nachtbüchlein*, ed. Bolte, ind. s. v. pfeiffe.

Among the Austrian peasants who had heard and seen so much of the terrible effects of the Prussian needle-guns during the war of 1866, a legend was current about Bismarck selling his soul to the devil in return for the secret of this new gun, a genuine folk-lore narrative. In the same way haye pipe and tobacco entered into popular traditions, ever since tobacco came to be generally used in Germany. In Grimm's fairy-tale *Das blaue Licht* we read of a soldier lighting his pipe with a blue flame supposed to be a will-o'-the-wisp.<sup>70</sup> In a soldier we may find smoking natural, even though he belong to the magic world of Grimm's fairy-tales, but to read of a spectre entering a room, sitting down at the table, pulling out a short pipe and beginning to smoke is decidedly queer.<sup>71</sup> A similar story is told by Rochholz<sup>72</sup> of a goblin, the spirit of the former proprietor of the house. It is just as queer, though easily explained by natural phenomena, to read of certain mountain-peaks in Switzerland where the *Berggeist* may be seen smoking tobacco;<sup>73</sup> but the idea of a *Wassermann* in Southern Bohemia leaving his pool, pipe in mouth,<sup>74</sup> is as grotesque as Hauptmann's scene. The devil, too, gets mixed up with tobacco: in a story told by Müllenhoff<sup>75</sup> he comes to grief while trying to get a pinch of snuff. Dwarfs smoke sometimes.<sup>76</sup> Will-o'-the-wisps are used to light the pipes.<sup>77</sup> We see that Hauptmann's smoking sprite has had numerous predecessors in German folk-lore.<sup>78</sup>

In the fourth act the *Waldschrat* asks Rautendelein for the wheel of the wagon that had once carried the bell, to roll it down the mountain. It is an allusion to the old custom *Rädertreiben* practised in some parts of Germany even at the present day.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>70</sup> *K.-M.* iii, p. 196.

<sup>71</sup> Grimm, *D. S.* No. 272.

<sup>72</sup> *Naturmythen*, p. 186.

<sup>73</sup> Rochholz, *ibid.*, p. 186.

<sup>74</sup> Vornaleken, *Mythen und Bräuche*, p. 177. According to a Danish legend a female wood-sprite may be seen in the forest smoking tobacco: Mannhardt, *ibid.* i, 125.

<sup>75</sup> *Sagen aus Schleswig-Holstein*, p. 276.

<sup>76</sup> Rochholz, *Naturmythen*, p. 187; Alpenburg, *Mythen und Sagen Tirols*, pp. 104, 168.

<sup>77</sup> Rochholz, *Schwäbische Sagen* ii, 70; cf. Hebel's Alemannic poem *Geisterbesuch auf dem Feldberg*.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. also Grimm, *Irische Elfenmythen*, p. xvi.

<sup>79</sup> Panzer, *Beitr.* i, 212; Jahn, *Die deutschen Opfergebräuche*, index s. v. *Rad*.

Though Hauptmann's *Schrat* is in the main an antique satyr, he has, as we have seen, an admixture of German blood. But the two elements are so well blended that there is no inconsistency in his character.

#### 4. RAUTENDELEIN.

Rautendelein's nature is not so clearly defined as that of either the *Nickelmann* or the *Schrat*; it is made up of different elements. She is called by the poet "ein elbisches Wesen." That means that she is not a human being, but partakes of the superhuman character of elfish beings. There is no figure in German folk-lore exactly corresponding. She calls herself "Waldfräulein," the *Schrat* calls her "Nixlein" (Act I). Heinrich addresses her as "windleichter Elfengeist"<sup>80</sup> (Act IV). She dances with the elves, as if she were one of them, but she remains when the others scatter in all directions; the *Schrat* may not treat her as he treats the elves, she is evidently more than a mere fairy.

As for the name Rautendelein, it was not, as has been claimed,<sup>81</sup> invented by Hauptmann. It is taken from the Silesian version of the well-known ballad *Schön Ulrich und Roth-Ännchen* or *Schön-Ännchen*; the title of that version is *Schön Ulrich und Rautendelein*.<sup>82</sup>

In the opening scene Rautendelein is sitting upon the edge of the well combing her golden hair with a golden comb and singing. The picture she presents reminds us at once of the *Loreley*; but it is characteristic of nixies in general. The nixie at Magdeburg may be seen sitting on the bank of the river combing her golden hair.<sup>83</sup> Müllenhoff tells of a maiden who rises from the pond every Whitsuntide and, seated upon a rock, combs her golden hair and sings.<sup>84</sup> The *Unstrutnixie* is pleased when the smooth surface of the water reflects her image.<sup>85</sup> Rochholz<sup>86</sup> speaks of a maiden who combs her fair hair with a golden comb and looks at her reflection in the water, just as Rautendelein does. Golden hair is a gen-

<sup>80</sup> *Windleichter Geist*, cf. *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 396.

<sup>81</sup> Wörner, *G. Hauptmann*, p. 78.

<sup>82</sup> Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Schlesische Volkslieder*, No. 12.

<sup>83</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 57.

<sup>84</sup> *Sagen und Märchen aus Schleswig-Holstein*, p. 109.

<sup>85</sup> Witzschel, *Thüringer Sagen* i, 279.

<sup>86</sup> *Schwäbische Sagen*, i, 240.



eral attribute of nixies,<sup>87</sup> and they like a golden comb.<sup>88</sup>

Rautendelein calls the *Nickelmann* "Herr Oheim" (Act I). This term may be taken in the general sense of an older relative, or else as being merely a form of address expressing both respect and a certain intimacy.<sup>89</sup> We see that Rautendelein has much in common with the female water-sprites of German folk-lore.<sup>90</sup> On the other hand Rautendelein tells Heinrich that she was found by the *Busch-grossmutter* in the woods (Act II), that the forest and the mountains are her home, that the wind is her element. She is, therefore, primarily, a sprite of the forest or of the air.<sup>91</sup> But as female forest-sprites in German traditions are generally very ugly creatures,<sup>92</sup> the poet was compelled to find other characteristics for Rautendelein; he turned to the nixies, the most beautiful female sprites in German folk-lore.<sup>93</sup> Rautendelein's unknown origin and the way in which she is picked up from moss and lichen remind us of the traditions about a mysterious child found on a bush along the road<sup>94</sup> or in the fields. Rochholz<sup>95</sup> relates:

"Sommers findet man in blühenden Kleeefeldern manchmal ein feinlockiges engelschönes Kind auf schneeweissen Windeln bloss daliegen."

The child in these traditions personifies the spirit of vegetation. The child of a *Waldweib* is sometimes found in the forest.<sup>96</sup>

Rautendelein does not know what tears are.

<sup>87</sup> Witzschel, *ibid.*, i, 287; Golther, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 146.

<sup>88</sup> Grimm, *K.-M.*, No. 181.

<sup>89</sup> cf. *D. W. s. v. Oheim*.

<sup>90</sup> This renders invalid Schütze's objection to the character of Rautendelein (*Americ. German*, iii, p. 88). Rautendelein is not an elf of light, her nature is composite as is that of many elves in mythology and folk-lore. In fact, it is often impossible to determine the native element of elves. Cf. Mogk in Paul's *Grundriss*, i, pp. 1035, 1036; Golther *Germ. Myth.*, pp. 126, 135, 153.

<sup>91</sup> "Die Waldelbe sind aufs engste mit den Windelben verknüpft." Golther, *ibid.*, p. 153; Meyer, *Germ. Mythol.*, p. 129.

<sup>92</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 400; Golther, p. 153; for an exception cf. Mannhardt, i, p. 88. Sometimes these sprites have beautiful flowing hair: Grimm, *D. S.* No. 50.

<sup>93</sup> Golther, p. 146.

<sup>94</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 14.

<sup>95</sup> *Schwäuersagen*, i, 273.

<sup>96</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 400.

Her first tear marks the change from the pure nature-sprite to a being endowed with human emotions. We need not be troubled by Hauptmann's inconsistency in making the little fairy at the beginning of the first act shed tears (also at the beginning of the fifth act). The idea that sprites do not shed tears is by no means general in German folk-lore,<sup>97</sup> though according to popular belief, witches cannot weep.<sup>98</sup> It may have been suggested by Fouqué's *Undine*, or by Andersen's tale *Die kleine Seejungfrau*.<sup>99</sup>

The *Nickelmann* offers to place Rautendelein's tear in a rose-colored shell, an allusion to the well-known belief that pearls are tears.<sup>100</sup> The *Unstrutnixe* collects the tears of a mourning mother and puts them as pearls into a golden shell.<sup>101</sup>

The beautiful stanzas in the fifth act which express Rautendelein's despair at being married with the *Nickelmann* show the influence of two Silesian ballads: *Die schöne Hannele*, referred to above, and its variant, *Die unglückliche Braut*.<sup>102</sup> The subject of the two ballads is the unfortunate union between the *Wassermann* or *Nickelmann* and a human maiden. The details of the two ballads are different from those in Rautendelein's song, but the *Grundstimmung* is the same; the despair at having to follow the *Wassermann*. The former ballad; *Schön Hannele*, throws light upon the obscure stanza dealing with the three apples. After *Hannele* has lived with the *Wassermann* for seven years, she hears the sound of the bell and asks permission to go to church just once. In the church she meets her parents and goes home with them to dinner:

"Und da sie den ersten Bissen ass, ---  
Fiel ihr ein Apfel auf den Schoß,  
Der schönen Hannele."

for her return, just as the *Elbjungfer* promises. The apple is the signal of the *Wassermann*.

<sup>97</sup> Grimm, *D. S.*, No. 50; *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 408.

<sup>98</sup> Wuttke, § 213.

<sup>99</sup> We know that Hauptmann, as a boy, wrote fairy-tales in Andersen's style: Schlenther, *G. Hauptmann*, pp. 13, 21.

<sup>100</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*,<sup>4</sup> p. 253; Vernaleken, *Mythen und Bräuche*, p. 197. Cf. Lessing's *Emilia Galotti*, Act II, sc. 7.

<sup>101</sup> Witzschel, i, 280.

<sup>102</sup> Hoffmann v. Fallersleben, *Schles. Volkslieder*, Nos. 1 and 3.



to send a plate with an apple to the surface of the water as a message of good fortune.<sup>103</sup> The apple is also the symbol of love and marriage.<sup>104</sup> The three apples in the fourth stanza are, therefore, the expression of the *Nickelmann's* love and the signal to come down to him. The white apple makes Rautendelein grow pale; the golden apple gives her riches, such riches as she spurned when the *Nickelmann* offered them at the end of Act I; the red apple signifies her death: to live with the *Nickelmann* after living with Heinrich is equivalent to death. *Rosenrot*, in popular poetry, is sometimes a color symbolical of death, as in the love-song:

"Jetzt leg ich mich nieder  
Auf Heu und auf Moos,  
Da fallen drei Rüsselein  
Mir in den Schoss.  
Und diese drei Rüsselein  
Sind rosenrot;  
Jetzt weiss ich nicht, lebt mein Schatz,  
Oder ist er tot."<sup>105</sup>

It is interesting to see how the poet follows popular traditions even in little details. Rautendelein has red shoes (Act IV), and red is the color of shoes in fairy-tales. In the story of the *Machandelbaum*<sup>106</sup> the bird brings the girl red shoes. There is a popular ballad in which the bride wears "red, red shoes,"<sup>107</sup> also a nursery rhyme in which the child takes pride in her red shoes.<sup>108</sup> Rautendelein puts fire-flies in her hair as an ornament, a trait characteristic of fairies; *Frau Venus*, in Simrock's *Amelungenlied* (ii, p. 316), wears fire-flies in her locks; in fairy-tales the fire-flies serve as lanterns.<sup>109</sup>

We see that Rautendelein's elfish nature is thoroughly German; the poet has used material found in German traditions.

JOHN A. WALZ.

Western Reserve University.

<sup>103</sup> Grimm, *D. M.*, 4 p. 410; *D. S.*, No. 60.

<sup>104</sup> Grimm, *D. W.*, ii, 122; *K.-M.*, No. 17; Erk-Böhme, i, p. 26; *Wunderhorn*, Berlin, 1846, iii, 27; v, 319.

<sup>105</sup> Wuttke, *Sächsische Volkskunde*, Dresden 1900, p. 243. The song begins *Jetzt geh ich zum Brünnele* and is found in different versions in many parts of Germany. Cf. Erk-Böhme, Nos. 203 ff.

<sup>106</sup> Grimm, *K.-M.*, No. 47.

<sup>107</sup> *Wunderhorn*, Berlin, 1846, ii, p. 14.

<sup>108</sup> Simrock, *Das deutsche Kinderbuch*, No. 476.

<sup>109</sup> Grimm, *K.-M.* No. 186; Andersen, *Der Reisekammerad*; Shakespeare, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act III sc., 1.

## ENGLISH LITERATURE.

*A New Study of the Sonnets of Shakespeare*  
by PARKE GODWIN. G. P. Putnam's Sons,  
New York and London: The Kickerbocker  
Press. 1900. 8vo, 306 pp.

SHAKESPEARE'S *Sonnets* like Shakespeare's epitaph, have had a sort of hypnotic effect on the men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; the one preventing the curious from disinterring the dust and bones of the mortal Shakespeare, the other alluring the savants to resuscitate the dead passions of the immortal poet. Nowadays it is not so much the newness of the theory respecting the *Sonnets* that attracts readers, as the intense interest awakened by the announcement of another victim to this hypnotic influence. And now the latest is Mr. Parke Godwin.

Mr. Godwin feelingly quotes Mr. Saintsbury in saying,

"no vainer fancies this side of madness ever entered the human mind, than certain expositions of the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare."

Therefore, despite this warning from one of the sanest critics of to-day, it is almost pathetic to watch Mr. Godwin searching for "a sort of guide in the interpretation of the *Sonnets* generally." Finally he finds his guide, and "either by design or accident," this "was the central sonnet of the series as a whole. Dividing 154 by 2 we get 77, which is, strange to say, the number of this sonnet. By whom the original numbering was done we do not know, but it is certainly not an extravagance to suppose that the writer himself may have purposely affixed this 77 to a sonnet which he considered in some degree explanatory."

It is to be regretted that Ignatius Donnelly could not have lived to read these lines! Before passing into this vast edifice of mystery it is worth while to linger in the introductory vestibule and note its construction. The Introduction, subdivided into two parts, seeks to give first, a brief history of the *Sonnets*, and secondly, an outline of former expositions of the *Sonnets*. It is hardly necessary or worth the reader's while to tarry long in this part of the structure. It is too brief to be truly valuable, and too carelessly constructed to edify the lover of good literary style. But a real fault, one frequently indulged in by so-called racy, popular critics, men who by trade are

journalists, and whose journalistic slipshod manner delights in a gaudy display of witty cleverness and exaggerated bombast, is to be found here, and should not pass muster without a word of censure. Inaccuracy is rampant. It is a wrathful Sansloy pricking along the plain of sonnet-land.

On the opening page of this Introduction it reads:

"A late historian of English literature tells us that at one time in the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was an outbreak of sonnet-writing, which for mass and beauty has never been paralleled. It was a form of verse which, having long held sway in Italy, passed through France into England, where it became a fashion. Introduced by Wyatt and Surrey about the year 1550, it was taken up by a great many others, and among them by Thomas Watson, whom Spenser calls 'the noblest swain that ever piped upon an oaten quill,' then by Spenser himself, the foremost poet of his age, and finally by Sir Philip Sidney, who, as scholar and soldier, enjoyed a universal popularity."

A footnote to this citation refers the reader to Saintsbury's *History of English Literature*, page 79 (which should read page 97). This careless use of Mr. Saintsbury's criticism should not be allowed. Long before 1550, Wyatt and Surrey introduced the sonnet. Most of Wyatt's love poems were probably written between 1525 and 1537. Wyatt died in 1542, and Surrey was beheaded in 1547. Further, the sonnet did not thus find its way into England through France. And further, Spenser did not precede, but followed Sidney with his sonnet-cycle. Later on another careless statement throws the reader's time-view out of perspective: "like these (sonnets) of Spenser, Sidney, Drummond, Constable, etc., which were contemporaneous." Drummond belongs to the post-Shaksperean group of poets, and his sonnets, though Elizabethan in fashion, are not contemporaneous with those of Spenser and Sidney. The proper historical place for Drummond's sonnets may best be presented in Mr. Schelling's words,

"Although the sonnet continued a popular form during the remainder of the reign of Elizabeth and that of her successor, excepting the work of William Drummond, a scholarly poet, who lived much in the past, and series like William Browne's *Cælia* and *Visions*, the

writing of sonnet sequence went out of the literary fashion with the close of the former reign."

Not only does Drummond look strange shouldering his way in between Sidney and Constable, but what will readers think when Browning is praised for his sonnets that "carry their meaning on their face." To avoid any misrepresentation I quote: "like those of Bowles, Keats, Wordsworth, and Mr. and Mrs. Browning."

Beside the pathetic this brief history of the Sonnet may be said to have its humorous side too:

"I shall not discuss these various wranglings further than to say that, in my guess, which is as good as another's, Mr. Tommy Thorpe, having read a deal in the early sonnets about begetting a 'son,' and also in the later sonnets about one Mr. Will—a pun on the author's name—and desiring at the same time to be quaint and funny for himself, put the two together in order to tell us how the exclusive author ('the onlie begetter') was no other than W. H. (Will Himself), or the veritable Master William Shakespeare."

This is doubly funny if the author thinks he is the first guesser. The Germans were before him.

The next section, upon the "authenticity and correctness" of the *Sonnets*, is also open to criticism. The author makes a wrong impression when he states,

"They were in circulation privately, according to Meres, for nearly twenty years during his lifetime, and much discussed among his friends."

They were first alluded to by Meres in 1598, and they were first published in 1609. After this date one would hardly speak of them as privately circulated. And later the author says: "Within twenty years after his decease . . . they were republished." In 1640, twenty-four years after his decease, they were reprinted with eight sonnets omitted and the order of sequence wholly changed. Again he says: "they were published seven years before he died, and attracted a great deal of attention because of his growing fame as a playwright." This is hardly warranted by the facts of the case. When Benson, in 1640, issued this altered form of the *Sonnets* he prefixed an address "to the reader," which in

forms us to-day that the *Sonnets* on their first publication were "less popular than the plays." If one considered the numerous editions of Sidney's or Spenser's works within a short lapse of time, one would hardly count the thirty-one years that intervened between the first publication of these *Sonnets* and their second altered publication as evidence of popularity. It is not exact to say "they were much discussed among his friends" and "attracted a great deal of attention." This exaggerated tone is really corrected by the writer himself in another place:

"To this brief history of the *Sonnets* it is perhaps well to add that they never acquired the popularity of Shakespeare's plays, or of his other poems: for while the *Venus and Adonis* and the *Lucrece* passed rapidly through several editions, the *Sonnets* were not republished until 1640—thirty-one years after the poet's death."

Because this same Quarto

"abounds in typographical and other errors which might easily have escaped the eyes of a proof-reader, but not those of the writer himself,"

Mr. Godwin believes that Shakespeare had nothing to do with its publication. All agree with this. What are we to think of the errors of this book? Here are a few specimen lines: "in Sonnet 48 (it should read 46), *their* is put for *thy* no less than four times." Again, "in Sonnet 144, the second line repeats the close of the first line," which should read, the beginning of the second line, etc. And two pages further on it states, "the (sic) most of them, in existence in 1597, when Meres alludes to them," which should read in 1598. Again he affirms that the second edition "omitted seven of the best sonnets," instead of eight. All these are slight mistakes, they, however, detract from the value of the work, and render questionable the "eccentric interpretation in which the editor indulges" later on.

I pass now to the second chapter of the Introduction. This treats of former expositions of the *Sonnets*. The author severely censures the varied views advanced by his predecessors in this domain of Shakespearean criticism. Three modes of exposition are classified briefly, fantastic, allegorical, and amatory. This last classification of the *Sonnets* the writer regards as the "most mis-

leading and pernicious;" namely, that expressing the poet's unbounded love and admiration for a young friend. The writer is wrong in supposing that Barnfield addressed his sonnets to a lady. His young Ganymede was no poetic illusion, but a friend in the flesh, whose personal charms are celebrated in the most orthodox sonnet language. The critic in hand refuses to entertain the idea that either the Earl of Pembroke or the Earl of Southampton could be the young friend of Seakespeare.

"Had the combatants paid any attention to the requirements of chronology, they would have seen that they were both barking up the wrong tree; for if we suppose the *Sonnets* to have been written during the period I have fixed—that is, between 1582 and 1592—as Southampton was born in 1573, and Pembroke in 1580, they were neither of them of any age to attract the notice of the poet."

It all depends on the "if we suppose." "Your If is the only peace-maker; much virtue in If."

Passing from this Introduction of fifty pages to the main body of the work, which has been subdivided into two parts: Part First, "A New Study of the Sonnets," and Part Second, "The Original Sonnets as Newly Arranged," one cannot but carry the impression of gross inaccuracy and superficialness such as I have called to the reader's attention in the survey of this Introduction. In this part of the work falls the writer's most serious task. He disclaims having a theory and he must prove at the same time that the sonnets arrange themselves of themselves, at least so far as to satisfy the judgment of the reader. The divisions that formed themselves in this spontaneous way may be arranged as follows:

- I. A central or explanatory sonnet.
- II. A few sonnets that cannot be gathered into a fold with any of the others, and stand out as so many Independents: nine in all.
- III. A group forming a somewhat continuous poem, which is commonly said to be a persuasion to a young man of genius and promise to get married, but which has, as I take it, an entirely different object.
- IV. A series of Love Poems, descriptive (a) of an early and ardent attachment, (b) of a separation from the beloved, (c) of the pains



and pleasures of absence, and (d) of a young poet's first impressions, under these circumstances, of the great world.

V. Another group of Love Poems, but of another kind, depicting the origin, progress, and end of an irregular amatory relation, and which may be called "The Episode of the Dark Lady."

VI. And finally, a group relating to the poet's communion with a Higher or Tenth Muse as he calls it, meaning the personified Spirit or Genius of Poetry in its highest conception. This group reveals (a) the youthful aspirations of the poet, (b) his efforts to realize them, (c) the obstacle he encounters, and (d) his ultimate success and triumph over all difficulties.

Of these divisions the first that requires attention is No. III. Because the young friend is advised to marry, and the word "marriage" does not enforce the obligation, the writer disavows the marital theory. I suppose all the wooings of *Love's Labor's Lost* are lost upon him for the same reason. Poetry sometimes expresses one thing in words of another. "Husband and wife," "the prospective bride and blessing of the lad" do not have to appear in black and white to convey an idea of their existence in the mind of the poet. True the language is often figurative, but the probable solution offered by Mr. Godwin renders this language absurd. He believes that the poet means the spiritual process of creation, or the exercise of his faculties in verse-writing or poetry. To secure such an interpretation resort is made to most far-fetched readings; for example, in the closing couplet of Sonnet 7, the word "son" is believed to mean "some product of his genius:"

"So thou, thyself outgoing in thy noon,  
Unlook'd on diest, unless thou get a son."

There is a great deal of beating about the bush to secure these very strange, or figurative if the word seems better, readings. Even former critics are misdealt with. In discussing Sonnet 25, Professor Dowden is only partly quoted and therefore made to appear in a false light. "His ode was not a complaint against adverse fortune, as Professor Dowden strangely remarks, but just the reverse," etc. What the Professor did say in full was this:

"In this sonnet Shakspeare makes his first complaint against Fortune, against his low condition. He is about to undertake a journey on some needful business of his own (XXVI. XXVII.), and rejoices to think that at least in one place he has a fixed abode, in his friend's heart (l. 14).

He turns his complaint into rejoicing. Professor Dowden was not far out of the way.

Certain of these sonnets the writer believes were addressed to Anne Hathaway.

"Interpreting these three sonnets as addressed by a rustic lover to his rustic sweetheart, may we not conclude from the little we know of the poet's real life, and not from guesses in the void, that if they related to any person in particular it must have been to Anne Hathaway, then or soon to become his wife?"

This is a curious process by which to arrive at a "must have been."

So one might follow the writer through all the "divisions" and finally through his rearrangement of the sonnets, finding numerous points of interest and numerous points for further criticisms. If one grant that the *Sonnets* are figurative at the outset, he will readily fall in line with this arrangement or any possible arrangements. It may be the advent of Higher Criticism into the region of the sonnet. I think the orthodox view, however, will continue to be held by those who have labored not only with the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare, but also with the sonnets of his many contemporaries.

C. F. McCLUMPHA.

University of Minnesota.

#### GOTHIC LANGUAGE.

*Kurze Einführung in das Studium des Gotischen* von WILHELM GLIESE, Oberlehrer an der Sophienschule zu Berlin. Heidelberg: 1900.

THIS introduction to the study of Gothic is, as the preface states, an attempt to lead the student by a shorter road than usual to the goal. It is an inductive method much on the order of Zupitza's *Einführung in das Mittelhochdeutsche*; it takes up and interprets a passage selected from the gospel of Mark and in this incidental manner gradually acquaints the student with the main points of Gothic grammar. It does not claim to be exhaustive, but advises the student after finishing the



book to continue his studies with the grammars of Braune or Streitberg, upon which indeed it is based. It aims as much as possible to take the place of the teacher, and is therefore especially designed for self-instruction.

The book begins with a short account of Wulfila and the Gothic monuments. Then follows a chapter upon accentuation, which is an excellent idea, as the Gothic grammars do not, as a rule, treat of this, and the learner is often at sea as to the pronunciation of words. His examples are well chosen, with the exception of *framáþjan*, which is not, as the author supposes, compounded with *fra*, but a derivative of the adjective *framaps*.

The chapter upon the first and second sound-shifting will be of use to the beginner, as neither Braune nor Streitberg treats of this.

In the section upon pronunciation we miss the mention of the twofold character of *ggw*, only the nasal quality being given. The assertion, page 82, that *dd* in *daddjan* is to be pronounced like English sonant *th*, because between vowels, is unfounded. That the *d* of the preposition *du* is unshifted (page 52) is improbable, as such exceptions do not, to my knowledge, occur (see Bugge, *Beitr.* xii, 420). *Ostrogotha* is not directly connected with O. H. G. *ōs-tar* 'ostwärts,' as Gliese, p. 67, asserts, but with Sanskrit *usra* 'shining' (see Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, p. 7). The book contains further a number of misstatements of a more serious character. Thus *waurkjan* is said not to be a weak verb simply because it does not exhibit the thematic vowel in the preterite. Inaptly put, to say the least, is the remark, p. 91: 'Das anlautende *h* vor *l*, *r* und *n* fällt im Deutschen aus, was seiner geringen Artikulation im Got. zuzuschreiben ist'; it makes it appear as if OHG. were a direct descendants of Gothic. Similarly, on p. 37, in tracing the development of OHG. *quēman* we are told: 'das *o* in nhd. *kommen* entsteht aus dem *i* in *qiman* durch Einfluss des in *q* liegenden *u*'. The author has evidently forgotten that the *i* of *qiman* is a special Gothic development. He also seems unaware that the *i* in OHG. *liggen* 'to lie' is due to the original *i* of the suffix as seen in OS. *liggian*, since he remarks, p. 49, that we should expect *lēgen*

instead of NHG. *liegen*. Worse still is the mistake, when he asserts, p. 60, that the *t* of Goth. *sitan* is shifted to 'Doppelspirans' (!) in OHG. *sizzen* (NHG. *sitzen*), 'weil es nach Vokal steht' (!). Where Gliese obtained the OHG. forms of *müssen* mentioned on p. 25: ahd. *māzza*, *muoza*, *mōza*, I have failed to discover. In citing the OHG. and MHG. forms of *ihnen* he writes: 'ahd. mhd. *in*, *im*,' as if *in* were the older form.

There are a number of misprints in the book. Besides those corrected by the author I have noted the following: p. 50, l. 13, *Gasathvands* for *Gasathvands*; p. 60, l. 8, *ahz* for *ahd.*; p. 73, l. 2 from below, *gaiggag* for *gaigagg*; p. 79, l. 16, *airpa* for *airpai* (dat.). Hardly misprints are the mistakes in the writing of the names of prominent Germanists; thus p. 4 Heyne appears as Heine, p. 5 Wilmanns with one *n*, and Kauffmann with one *f*.

The dictatorial manner which the author assumes is rather unpleasant. He begins with the optatives *man lese*, *man merke*, etc., but soon abandons these for the more decided imperative; even that, however, is not strong enough for him, and he twice resorts to the infinitive *Einprägen*!

In spite of the errors which the book contains, it may nevertheless be used with profit by any earnest student who has not the advantage of personal instruction.

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY.

University of Pennsylvania.

### SHAKESPEARE.

*Shakespeare's Life and Work*, being an abridgment, chiefly for the use of students, of *A Life of William Shakespeare*, by SIDNEY LEE. London: Smith, Elder and Co.; New York: Macmillan Co. 1900. i-xiv, 1-232. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

MR. LEE has here given a succinct statement of the duly attested facts in the career of Shakespeare together with a full record, as far as known, of the dates and historical environments of each of the dramatist's works. Though much smaller than the original *Life*, the abridgment omits nothing essential and is as good a piece of work architecturally as its prototype. Exclusive of Appendix the una-

bridged edition contains twenty-one chapters, the student's edition nineteen; the original four chapters on the *Sonnets* are replaced by two, though but little is omitted. With these exceptions the Student's Edition retains the same chapter and paragraph headings, and the Index at the back shows hardly the change of a word. Wider research has not induced the author to modify any of the views formerly enounced, though I notice the negligible change of date for Elizabeth's death from March 26, 1693, to March 24, and the misprint *imued* for *imbued* (p. 46, l. 25).

On p. 94 it seems to be a purely gratuitous insinuation, in view of the lack of evidence either way, that the Shakespeares perpetrated a deliberate lie to secure the coat of arms: "This allegation [that a former armorial coat had been obtained in 1568] is not noticed in the records of the college, and may be a formal fiction designed by John Shakespeare and his son to recommend their claim to the notice of the heralds in 1596."

The anecdote of Shakespeare, Burbage, William the Conqueror, and "a lady in the audience" is necessarily so emasculated in the telling (p. 139) as to suggest the propriety of omitting it entirely, at least from the Student's Edition.

I hope soon to endeavor to show that Shakespeare commentators have hitherto greatly understated the number and apparent aimlessness of the differences between the Shakesperian Folios, especially between the First Folio and the Second. Mr. Lee affirms (p. 173) that

"The Second Folio was reprinted from the First; a few corrections were made in the text, but most of the changes were arbitrary and needless."

Needless they may have been, but not arbitrary, the syntax of the First Folio being to that of the Second as spoken speech is to written.

In the Appendix (p. 205) Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik* should be mentioned beside Abbott's *Shakespearean Grammar*.

As in the larger edition, so here the author eschews merely æsthetic criticism, thus rendering the change of title somewhat misleading; but the facts are stated so clearly, the deductions are based on such sane con-

siderations drawn from so wide a field of investigation and presented in so pleasing a style that the book must meet with a hearty welcome in our colleges and universities. I venture to say that even a cursory reading of this little volume by a student just entering upon the serious study of Shakespeare will give him a better idea of the problems that confront Shakespeare scholarship as well as of the attitude and method necessary for their solution than the reading of any other single volume of equal compass. It will at least impress the salutary lesson that patient and protracted investigation hath its victories no less renowned and certainly more abiding than those of brilliant conjecture and specious generalization.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

University of Paris.

#### THE MEDIÆVAL EPIC.

*Zu den Kunstformen des mittelalterlichen Epos* (Hartmann's "*Iwein*," *Das Nibelungenlied*, Boccaccio's "*Filostrato*" und Chaucer's "*Troilus und Cryseyde*." Von RUDOLPH FISCHER. Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, IX. Wien u. Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1899. xviii + 370 pp.

PROFESSOR FISCHER'S work is an attempt to gain criteria for the study of the epic by separating it, in a somewhat anatomical manner, into divisions and subdivisions. These are grouped under various categories, and deductions are drawn from the preponderance of now one and then another category. The author demonstrates his method by application to Hartmann's *Iwein*, and the results thus gained are made use of in the examination of the other poems under consideration. *Iwein* is divided into three parts, not taking into account the prologue (thirty lines) and the epilogue (seven lines). In the first part (ll. 31-2445) the hero sets out on his search for adventure and glory, and finds love. In the second part (ll. 2446-5563) he loses his lady, towards whom he has outwardly broken faith in his desire for adventure, and as an unknown knight regains her respect. In the third part (ll. 5564-8159), after further glorious adventures, he succeeds in bringing about a complete reconciliation. These three main parts con-

stitute, according to Fischer, practically independent stories which are connected only by the circumstance that the chief characters are identical in all.

Each of these divisions has an initial impulse, *ein erregendes Moment*, which starts the action. In the first part it is the tale of Kalogreant concerning his adventure with King Ascalon; in the second it is the admonition of Gawein; in the third, the strife of the two sisters. The remainder of each part, with the exception of the first, is then divided into a number of distinct sections (*Abschnitte*). The second part has four of these, the third part has two.

The smallest sub-divisions into which the author divides the poem are called 'pictures' (*Bilder*), which might be considered as corresponding to the scenes of a drama. Of these there are seventy-nine in the poem. By way of illustration, it may be stated that the first 'picture' extends from l. 31 to l. 85, the second from l. 86 to l. 878, the third from l. 879 to l. 944. Two portions, ll. 2971-3028 and 7015-7074, are left out of consideration as being inorganic interpolations. The 'pictures' vary in length from fifteen lines to seven hundred and ninety-three lines, and it is evident that other critics might subdivide some of the longer ones, and amalgamate some of the shorter ones. But even accepting the author's grouping, his conclusions are not always warranted.

The poem is further divided as to contents into two elementary parts: I, psychological, which is identical with the first of the divisions mentioned above; and II, fabulistic, corresponding to the other two parts of the former division. The psychological part is represented as being devoted mainly to inner, the fabulistic to outward action.

The 'pictures' are classified, according to their contents, as dramatic, presenting only a single action, and epic, presenting a situation or a series of events. The dramatic 'pictures' are supposed to possess a greater value than the epic, and the preponderance of pictures belonging to the one or the other category is used as a test of literary merit. There are in *Iwein* fifty-one dramatic 'pictures' and twenty-eight epic 'pictures.' They are further sub-

divided into 'pure' and 'impure,' signifying that they are entirely epic or dramatic, or mixed, in that they contain elements of both categories. The several main divisions of the poem are then contrasted with regard to their relative amounts of the various kinds of 'pictures,' pure epic, pure dramatic, impure epic, impure dramatic, predominately epic, predominately dramatic. The 'pictures' are also classified as regards their length into short, medium and long, and various conclusions are drawn from the comparative number of these in the several parts.

After the discussion of the 'pictures' in their various phases the author passes to the discussion of the dramatic forms (*dramatische Formen*). The dramatic element is divided into the two main categories of lyric (monologue) and dramatic (dialogue and address), dialogue being characterized as *voll-dramatisch*, address as *halbdramatisch*. Dialogue is further divided into 'duologue' and 'polylogue,' and all these subdivisions are treated as to number, length, and frequency in the several parts of the story. For example, part I is called *monolog-freundlich*, while II is said to be *monolog-feindlich*.

The chapter on *Figuren-Technik* is devoted to the examination of the scope and function of the various persons that appear in the poem. These are divided into two groups, main and secondary. The four main characters are the *Heldenpaar*, Iwein and Laudine, and the *Vertrautenpaar*, Gawein and Lunette. The remaining persons constitute the secondary characters. Comparisons are made as to the relative amounts of monologue, address, dialogue, duologue and polylogue that fall to the share of each of these groups of characters. For example, the *Heldenpaar* have numerically a slightly larger number of lines than the *Vertrautenpaar*. The former, however, appear twice as often, hence it is argued

"Die dramatische Bewegung der Helden ist also erregter, die der Vertrauten ruhiger. Der Wirkungskreis der Helden ist eben ein weiterer, der der Vertrauten ein engerer." Similar contrasts are established as to Iwein and Laudine, Gawein and Lunette. One averages twenty-two lines to a scene (*Auftritt*), the other twenty-seven, hence "greater vi-



vacuity" and "greater tranquility" are respectively predicated of them.

After these and similar comparisons, made on the basis of the whole poem, the two parts, psychological and fabulistic, are examined as to the number of characters appearing in each, the relative frequency of the main and secondary characters, the length of passages, monologue, dialogue and so forth. Duologue is divided into categories: that which takes place between two main characters, between a main and a secondary character, and between two secondary characters. The two parts are also contrasted as to the frequency and length of the several kinds of dialogue.

An exhaustive resumé of the part devoted to *Iwein* is given at the close.

It will be in order now to examine some of the author's statements in detail. The work is based almost entirely on numbers and numerical relations, and yet the deductions drawn from them are often forced. Of the total number of lines on the poem, part first contains 30%, part second 38%, part third 32%, on which ratios the author, page 4, makes the following observation:

"Anfang und Ende sind also relativ knapp gehalten gegenüber der breit ausladenden Mitte, d.h. der Dichter versteht es, seinen Leser rasch in die Handlung zu verwickeln und, nachdem er ihn dann nach stark erregtem Interesse lange am behaglicher ausgeführten Mitteltheil festgehalten, wieder rasch aus der Handlung vor Erlahmung des Interesses herauszuholen."

On the next page reference is made to "die oben festgestellte Kürze dieses ersten Compositions-theiles des Gedichtes," and further on the three parts are again characterized: "erst die rasche Einführung, dann die breite Durchführung, endlich die knappere Ausführung." The above ratios of 30, 38, 32 do not, of course, justify these characterizations.

Again, on page 8, the average length of the 'pictures' is given as 103 lines. In casting about for a standard, the author arbitrarily fixes upon a measure of length for the purpose of grouping the pictures as short, medium and long. Those up to 20 lines in length are called short, those from 20 to 100 medium, and over 100 lines, long. The length of the 'pictures' ranges from 15 lines to 793, with an average of 103.

By the author's classification one of 21 lines is classed as medium, and one of 101 lines, less than the average length, is classed as long. According to this division there are 6 short, 48 medium, and 25 long. Numerous conclusions are drawn from these figures (p. 8 seqq.), conclusions that are at once found to be mistaken as soon as another norm is taken for the classification as short, medium, long. For example, if we should call those having up to 50 lines short, those from 51 to 100 medium, and over 100, long, we should get the following figures: 26 short, 28 medium, 25 long, as against 6, 48, 25, respectively, in the author's division. Again, page 26, in treating the heading "address," the division is made into short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-30, long, 31-150, while dialogue is classed as short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-100, and long, 101-400. In the discussion of the 'pictures' in the *Nibelungen*, page 94, the division is short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-50, and long, 51-130, the average length being 38 lines. The arbitrariness of such divisions invalidates the deductions drawn from them. Nor do the conclusions on page 9 as to the relative number of the various 'pictures,' short, medium, and long, in Parts I and II hold, if the norm of 50-100 proposed above be substituted for that of 20-100, a classification certainly more legitimate than the one used by the author.

Similarly, the division of the poem into three parts, as well as the division into 'pictures,' may be challenged. Thus in that one extending from l. 86 to l. 878, lines 259-802, where Kalogreant tells his story, clearly constitute a separate division, which in turn could be divided at ll. 397, 542, 599, 762. Again the division at l. 966 seems forced; and so in numerous other instances.

The section on the epic and dramatic elements is not convincing. While there are portions which can be classed as dramatic, and others which may be called epic, there are a large number of 'pictures' the classification of which is extremely doubtful, so much so that properly no statistics could be based upon it.

The conclusions drawn from the figures are just as fanciful as those previously mentioned: a ratio of  $1\frac{1}{2}:1$  serves as a basis for the statement: "Das dramatische Element über



wiegt und es sichert dadurch dem ganzen eine grosse Lebhaftigkeit" (p. 15).

The division into main and secondary characters is also more or less arbitrary. Other critics might distinguish two, three, five or six main characters instead of four, and in that case the whole structure so elaborately built up by the author would collapse.

By the aid of the method applied to *Iwein*, the author seeks to throw some light on the genesis of the *Nibelungenlied*. In order to gain a parallel to *Iwein*, the investigation of the *Nibelungen* is restricted to the first ten books, 1082 strophes of Lachmann's edition. This is divided into two parts, H, "Siegfried's Hochzeit," and T, "Siegfried's Tod." Each of these is further divided into sections, which, on examination, are found to correspond to Lachmann's 'books,' with the exception that Bk. iv, of Lachmann is resolved into two divisions, and Bks. vi and vii yield three of Fischer's.

The arbitrary nature of the author's categories is again exemplified in this part. In *Iwein* he takes no account of the fact that Hartmann's poem is not an original piece of work, while in the *Nibelungen* all the deductions are drawn from contrasts between the work of the *Umdichter* and that of the *Dichter*, in other words, between the text of MS. A and that portion of the same which Lachmann pronounced genuine. Fischer's faith in this division is so great that he speaks of "die beiden Versionen" (p. 108), as if they existed as separate texts.

Recently Braune has shown that the "Plus-strophen" of MS. B are in reality omissions of the MS. from which A descends. As these strophes occur for the most part in the portion treated by Fischer, they might have changed his ratios, had they been taken into account, especially as many of the ratios are so close that no safe conclusion could properly be drawn from them. For example, on page 104 ratios of 1:1.56 and 1:1.60 are compared: "Der Unterschied ist nur gering, aber er spricht zu Gunsten von S.<sup>1</sup>" On page 105 the author says of ratios of 1:1.67 and 1:1.60, "der Unterschied ist zwar klein, aber charakteristisch." Numerous similar instances could be cited.

The treatment of *Filostrato* and *Troilus*

und *Cryseyde* is so similar to that of *Iwein* and the *Nibelungen* that it is unnecessary to enter into details.

The whole method of judging by volume and mass seems of questionable value. While apparently concrete and objective, the basis for most of the processes is in reality subjective and even arbitrary. To characterize certain sections as epic, dramatic, predominately epic, predominately dramatic, simply by the comparative number of lines of the given type, does not commend itself as a sound method of literary criticism.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Johns Hopkins University.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### THE ANGLO-SAXON DANIEL

320-325.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—One of the most interesting of the corrupt passages in the Anglo-Saxon poem *Daniel* is that beginning with line 320 and ending with line 325. According to Grein-Wülker reading, it runs as follows:

"and seo mænigeo mære wære  
had to hebbanne swa heofonsteorran  
bebugað bradne hwyrft oð þæt brim faropæs,  
sæwaroða sand geond sealtne wæg  
in eare gryndeð, þæt his unrim a  
in wintra worn wurðan sceolde."

The chief difficulty with this reading is that the clause "oð þæt brim faropæs, sæwaroða sand," is not co-ordinate with the clause "heofonsteorran bebugað bradne hwyrft," as it evidently should be to bring out the meaning of the original: "Quibus locutus es, pollicens quod multiplicares semen eorum sicut stellas coeli, et sicut arenam quae est in littore maris." To obviate this difficulty, Cosijn proposes to read, in line 322, "þe bugað bradne hwyrft oððe brimfaropæs<sup>3</sup>." This gets rid of a certain awkwardness in the construction, and is, at the same time, true to the

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of convenience, the Vulgate text is here regarded as the original, though as Hofer points out—*Anglia* xii, 169—the text actually used was probably an earlier Latin translation of the Septuagint.

<sup>2</sup> *Daniel*, iii, 36 (Vulgate).

<sup>3</sup> Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, xx, 111.

original. The Bosworth-Toller translation of "*heofonsteorran bebugað bradne hwyrft*," as "the stars of heaven encompass a spacious circle (the earth<sup>4</sup>)," is misleading. *Hwyrft* obviously refers to the heavens (that which goes about, revolves around, the earth); and *bugað* should have the force of 'fill' ('dwell in,' 'occupy'). 'The stars which fill the spacious circle of the heavens,' would thus be a better rendering. Cosijn's reading, therefore, ought certainly to be adopted.

For similar reasons, should we not read, in line 324, "*pe in eare gryndeð*" instead of "*in eare gryndeð*"? In the corresponding line in *Azarias*, we possibly have the *pe* preserved in *ype*—plainly a corruption, since there is no warrant for it in the original. A *pe* standing absolutely alone in this way is, of course, not unusual: see, for example, *Gen.* 365, 627; *Crist* 353, 483; *Guth.* 587. As to *his uurim a*, the text of *Azarias*, *swa urime* (referring back to *heofonsteorran* as the most conspicuous noun indicating number preceding) is, on the whole, to be preferred; but, since *his uurim a* yields a fairly satisfactory sense, a change is perhaps unwarranted.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD FULTON.

5 Bedford Place, London, W. C.

#### AN ARITHMETICAL PROBLEM IN VALDÉS'S JOSÉ.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I have recently noted a surprising arithmetical miscalculation in the *José* of Valdés, occurring in the third chapter, in the account of the settling of the bill between 'la señá Isabel' and José. The figures, found on pages 30 and 31 of the text edited by F. J. A. Davidson, Boston, 1900, are as follows: José has delivered to Isabel "El domingo, 307 libras - - - el lunes, 1040, - - - el martes, 2200, - - - el jueves, 235, - - - hoy, 1140." That is, a total of 4922 lbs. The prices for the various days were "El domingo - - á real; el lunes á tres cuartillos; el martes [á medio real, p. 30] - - el jueves á real y medio, y hoy á real." Isabel proposes, on the pretext that the account is hard to cast on this arrangement, but really, as other passages show beyond reason-

<sup>4</sup> See under *hwyrft*.

able doubt, to cheat José out of a few extra duros, that she pay for the whole at the rate of 7 cuartos (that is, 28 maravedis, or  $\frac{28}{34}$  real); the whole price which she then offers being then 4053  $\frac{7}{17}$  reales. But according to the rates for each day, as given above, she would have had to pay, Sunday, 307 r.; Monday, 780 r.; Tuesday, 1100 r.; Thursday, 352  $\frac{1}{2}$  r.; and the day in question 1140 r.; that is, in all, only 3679  $\frac{1}{2}$  r.. That is, she loses, by her own proposition, 373 r., 31 mar. Yet Valdés most certainly represents her as gaining by the transaction: "Terminó al fin la señá Isabel; aprobó José su propio despojo", and Prof. Davidson explicitly states in his note that "She cheats him out of a little more than 4 maravedis on the pound" (p. 182, note 1 to page 31). The mistake on the part of the editor is probably due to the calculation that the average of the prices for the several days, as given above, is 32.3 maravedis, whereas her offer is for only 28 mar.; the error being in the neglect of the fact that no such average may be taken as base of comparison, since the amount sold varied on the several days.

ERNEST H. WILKINS.

Amherst College.

#### ARCADIA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The definiteness of certain descriptions of place in Sidney's *Arcadia* is in contrast with the general character of the descriptions in that artificial romance. There is a charming individuality in the little stream in which the ladies bathe, as it is described in Bk. ii, Chap. ii; and there are still more striking traits of reality in the description of Kalander's house in Bk. i, Chap. 2, to which I wish particularly to call attention. The description of the house is as follows:

"The house itselfe was built of faire and strong stone, not affecting so much any extraordinary kind of finenesse as an honourable representing of a firme statelinesse. The lights, doores and staires, rather directed to the use of the guest than to the eye of the Artificer; . . . . . each place handsome without curiosity, and homely without loathsomenesse; . . . . . all more lasting than beautiful, but that the consideration of the exceeding lastingnesse made the eie believe it was exceedingly beautifull."

The varied and mingled beauties of the gardens are then described.

Mr. Philip Sidney in his recent Memoirs of the Sidney Family suggests that one of his two country homes was in Sir Philip's mind when he wrote this. The description of Penshurst, the Sidneys' country home, in Jonson's Epistle addressed to it, seems to make it clear that Penshurst was in fact the original of Kalander's house.

"Thou art not, Penshurst, built to envious show  
Of touch, or marble; nor canst boast a row  
Of polished pillars or a roof of gold:  
Thou hast no lantern, whereof tales are told;  
Or stair or courts; but stand'st an ancient pile,  
And these grudged at, are revered the while."

And again:

"Thy walls be of the country stone."

The surroundings of the house, too, as described by Jonson, especially the orchard, agree closely enough with those which Sidney represents about the house of Kalander. For so 'homely' a residence Penshurst had remarkable fortune, to be praised by three such poets as Sidney, Jonson, and Waller.

MORRIS W. CROLL.

University of Pennsylvania.

#### ZURÜCKE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In Mr. A. B. Nichols's edition of the *Jungfrau von Orleans* the following note to line 1125 is found: "*zurücke*. In MHG. the adverb ended in *-e*; this is still seen in *lange, ferne, gerne, stille*, and is still used by the poets in other cases." The above statement of fact is true as far as it goes, but would it not be well to tell the whole truth? The inference which one might justly draw from the above note would be that *zurücke* is to be placed in the same category with *lange, ferne*, etc., and that the ending *-e* of *zurücke* had the same origin as the *-e* of the adverbs *lange, ferne*, etc. It may perhaps not be considered necessary that an undergraduate should know that *-e* in *lange, ferne*, etc., stands for the OHG. adverb-forming suffix *-o*, as found in *lango, ferno*, etc., and that *zurücke* is really a prepositional phrase, which in OHG. had the form *zi rucke*; but in its present form the note is at the best misleading.

CLARENCE WILLIS EASTMAN.

University of Iowa.

#### A NEW RABELAIS EDITION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Mr. L. Rosenthal, the well-known antiquarian of Munich, claims the honor of an exceedingly interesting discovery for French literature; namely, a copy of the fifth book of Rabelais's story of *Gargantua et Pantagruel*, in an edition published in 1549, during the lifetime of the author. In order to appreciate the importance of this text, we must remember that the oldest edition we have depended upon so far is dated 1564, eleven years after Rabelais's death. We had besides a few chapters of one printed in 1562. The prevailing opinion was, up to the present, that the author, thinking to be prudent, did not actually publish this fifth book of his work himself, because of the very sharp attacks on the society of the time which are contained in it. The complete disappearance of the supposed edition of 1549 would be testimony to the great vigor shown by the church and state authorities of the sixteenth century. It may well be that Mr. Rosenthal possesses the only copy that escaped censure and fire.

However that may be, the new edition at hand dissipates all doubt as to the authenticity of the last part of the immortal *chef-d'œuvre* of Rabelais—authenticity which has been so strongly doubted by scholars of the highest standing.<sup>1</sup> Those who did not take this extreme position were nevertheless unanimous in admitting that we did not know the book in its original form. Thus, for them also, the recently announced discovery is of momentous importance, since it will allow a positive line of demarcation to be drawn between the Rabelaisian text and the interpolations and changes due to unscrupulous editors.

So far only the size of the book discovered has been made known to the public. Mr. Rosenthal gives it as a 16mo, containing sixty-four pages of twenty-one lines each. Yet even this very little bit of news suffices to show that the edition of 1564 was, as is generally admitted, overloaded with spurious material.

In the edition of Burgaud des Marets et Rathery, for instance, the fifth book covers over two hundred pages of rather small print. Although a considerable portion of many of

<sup>1</sup> The last time by Brunetière: *Questions de Critique*, 1897, pp. 2-22.



these pages is taken up by notes, the edition is still much longer than the sixty-four pages of original text can possibly justify.

The value of the find under notice will appear all the more important if we recall the fact that this fifth book was referred to, where opinions of Rabelais were quoted, comparatively more frequently than any other part of *Gargantua et Pantagruel*. Here are to be found the famous descriptions of *l'Isle sonnante*, of the *Archiduché des Chats fourrés*, of the *Pays des Lanternois*, of the *Oracle de la dive bouteille*, etc.

The following is the exact title of the 1549 edition:

Le cinquiesme  
livre  
des faicts et  
dictz du noble Pan-  
tagruel;  
Auquelz sont comprins,  
les grans Abus, & d'esordonnée  
Vie de, Plusieurs Es-  
tatz, de ce mō  
de.  
Composez par M. Francoys  
Rabelays Docteur, en Medeci-  
ne & Abstracteur de quite Essen-  
ce  
Imprime en Lan Mil cinc-  
cens Quarante neuf.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Bryn-Mawr College.*

#### OBITUARY.

##### VEIT VALENTIN.

ON the twentieth of December, 1900, Professor Veit Valentin, the President of the *Akademische Gesamt-Ausschuss* of the *Freie Deutsche Hochstift* at Frankfurt am Main, and a member of the executive council of the *Goethe-Gesellschaft*, was stricken down by acute congestion of the brain, which led to his death on the twenty-fourth, in the fifty-eighth year of his age. He had been suffering with severe headaches for more than a year, and a trip to Vienna, where he attended the unveiling of the Goethe monument, brought on the fatal crisis.

He was a native of Frankfurt and came of highly gifted stock. His uncle, the poet and critic Georg Friedrich Daumer, early aroused in him an ardent love of poetry and that keen appreciation of æsthetic form which became

the salient characteristic of his writings. As a student of theology and philosophy at Göttingen, he showed his devotion to scientific ideals, uninfluenced by the thought of a *Brotstudium*, by occupying himself chiefly with the Semitic languages and the related Coptic; the fruit of his work in this field was a treatise on *Die Bildung des koptischen Nomens*, 1866. Going thence to Berlin, he became a pupil of Eduard Gerhard, and devoted himself to the study of archæology and the fine arts generally, for which he was by nature peculiarly fitted, and in which he soon displayed exceptional ability. During the next two decades, as *Oberlehrer* in what is now the municipal *Realgymnasium* of Frankfurt, he found leisure to write a number of critical and æsthetic essays, among which his contribution to Dohme's *Kunst und Künstler* on the German painters of the first half of the nineteenth century (Cornelius, Overbeck, Veit, Schnorr, Führich) is perhaps the most widely known; they showed an unusual breadth of scholarship, a philosophical turn of mind, and marked originality of conception and treatment. From the time when he became connected with the *Hochstift*, he confined himself almost entirely to the study of Goethe; besides numerous articles, he published, in 1894, a volume on *Goethe's Faustdichtung in ihrer künstlerischen Einheit dargestellt*. The new theory concerning Homunculus and Helena which he advanced in this book, excited particular attention; he supported it further by an elaborate and ingenious argument in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, Vol. xvi, and defended it in two articles in the *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, Vol. xiii, Nos. 7 and 8, and Vol. xv, Nos. 7 and 8. The second of these two was the last article from his pen published during his lifetime. A comprehensive treatise on *Die Klassische Walpurgisnacht in Goethe's Faust* was ready for the printer at the time of his death, and will appear in the near future; a book on æsthetics, on which he had been working for a number of years, remains unfinished. In pedagogical circles he will be remembered as the editor of a series of school texts with excellent introductions; the *Goetheforschung* loses by his untimely death an ardent admirer and an enthusiastic student and expounder of his great fellow-townsmen.

HUGO K. SCHILLING.